

JPRS-UPA-88-047
21 OCTOBER 1988



**FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE**

JPRS Report

Soviet Union

Political Affairs

Soviet Union

Political Affairs

JPRS-UPA-88-047

CONTENTS

21 OCTOBER 1988

PARTY, STATE AFFAIRS

Yakovlev, Songayla Address Lithuanian Party Ideological Aktiv	[SOVETSKAYA LITVA, 16 Aug 88]	1
Yakovlev Answers Questions From LiSSR Aktiv Participants	[SOVETSKAYA LITVA, 17 Aug 88]	16
Speeches by Participants in LiSSR Party Ideological Aktiv	[SOVETSKAYA LITVA, 17 Aug 88]	22
Yakovlev Holds Question-Answer Session With Lithuanian Scientists	[SOVETSKAYA LITVA, 14 Aug 88]	30
Yakovlev Meets With Representatives of Lithuanian Intelligentsia	[SOVETSKAYA LITVA, 14 Aug 88]	36
Proposed Lithuanian SSR Constitution Amendments Examined	[VAKARINES NAUJIENOS, 25 Jul 88]	43
Former BSSR Chief Mazurov Discusses Stalin, Khrushchev, Brezhnev Regimes	[V. Portnykov; MOLOD UKRAYINY, 3 May 88]	44
Khatlon Party Obkom Holds First Plenum	[KOMMUNIST TADZHIKISTANA, 18 Sep 88]	50

HISTORY, PHILOSOPHY

Historian Afanasyev Addresses Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact in Estonia	51
Pact, Secession Rights Discussed	[SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA, 25 Aug 88] 51
Meetings Mark Pact Anniversary	[P. Myaello; SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA, 25 Aug 88] 53
Crimes of Stalin, Henchmen in Azerbaijan Revealed	[M. Katibli; KOMMUNIST, 11 Jun 88] 55

RELIGION

Officer On Need for Contemporary Approach to Atheistic Education	
[A. Brusenskiy; AGITATOR ARMII I FLOTA No 15, Aug 88]	60
Renovation of Monastery Reported	60
New Church Built for Believers in Stavropol Oblast	60

CULTURE

Frunze Hosts 5th All-Union Turkic Culture Conference	62
First Ukrainian Language Holiday Celebrated	62

SOCIAL ISSUES

Kiev's Proposed Dry Law Set Aside For Time Being	63
US-Soviet Cooperation on AIDS Research Progressing	63

REGIONAL ISSUES

KGB Boss Discusses Rise of Espionage Activities in Leningrad [V.M. Prilukov; LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA, 20 Aug 88]	64
Lithuanian SSR Afghanistan Casualties Noted	66
Racism Motif in Latvian Environmental Movement	66
'Crisis' Ecological Situation in Baku Discussed [O. Zeynalov; BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY, 4 Aug 88]	67
Estonian Production Association First To Pay for Natural Resources [L. Levitskiy; IZVESTIYA, 23 Jul 88]	71
Reader Complains About Lack of Ukrainian Language Schools in Kharkov	72
Radioactive Accident in Kirovograd Oblast Described [M. Volok; RADYANSKA UKRAYINA, 16 Sep 88]	72
Yerevan University Official Advocates New Union, Autonomous Republics [KOMMUNIST, 25 Jun 88]	72



Yakovlev, Songayla Address Lithuanian Party Ideological Aktiv

18000652 Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian
16 Aug 88 pp 1-3

[ELTA article: "In the Interests of the Country and Each People; Meeting of the Republic Party Ideological Aktiv." First three paragraphs are source introduction]

[Text] As we have already reported, the meeting of the republic's party ideological aktiv was held on 12 August in Vilnius. At this meeting, the question of work on the practical realization of the political directives of the 19th All-Union Party Conference and the decisions of the July (1988) CPSU Central Committee Plenum was discussed.

Participants in the meeting were CPSU Central Committee Politburo Member and Secretary A. N. Yakovlev; Comrades R. I. Songayla, Yu. I. Bernatavichus, A. K. Brazauskas, S. A. Gedraytis, I. V. Lukauskas, L. K. Maksimovas, N. A. Mitkin, V. V. Sakalauskas, L. K. Shepetis, P. P. Shileykis, K. V. Zaletskas, and Yu. M. Sheris; V. A. Mikhaylov, deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee department of organizational-party work, and O. R. Latsis, first assistant editor of the journal KOMMUNIST.

Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee First Secretary R. I. Songayla opened the meeting with an introductory address.

Introductory Address of R.I. Songayla

Respected comrades! The resolutions of the 19th All-Union Party Conference and the July Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee have given great impetus to the process of perestroika. They have opened up even greater possibilities for our country's workers for manifesting their creative potential and initiative, and for the real and active participation of each one in the political and socio-economic transformations of revolutionary scope.

The party and the people are armed with an integral program of comprehensive renovation of Soviet society. Today the task of each party reorganization—from the primary to the republic level—is to urgently achieve progress toward the outlined limits.

How has work developed here on the practical realization of the political directives of the 19th All-Union Party Conference and the decisions of the July Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee? On what questions should we concentrate in our republic, and based on what conditions? That is what we propose to discuss at this meeting.

Upon their return from the party forum, the conference delegates are sparing neither effort nor time in transmitting in lively discourse its innovative mood and its democratic and principled spirit. With the participation

of the delegates, we are continuing a cycle of television broadcasts on the problems of bringing to life each resolution and other documents of the party conference.

The special work groups for preparing proposals aimed at improving party ideological work, the republic Constitution, socio-economic activity and ecology which were created on the eve of the conference under the Lithuanian CP Central Committee, the Supreme Soviet Presidium and the Council of Ministers are working ever more actively.

The center of attention of the party committees today are the preparations for the reporting-electoral campaign. Preparations have begun for the regular Lithuanian CP Central Committee Plenum which is planned for the end of September. Its topic will be "On reorganizing the work of the republic's primary party organizations in light of the political directives of the 19th All-Union Party Conference and the July (1988) Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee."

The 19th All-Union Party Conference once again stressed that today the most important concern is to give primary attention to the individual, to the satisfaction of his needs and demands, and to the creation of favorable conditions for his spiritual growth.

One very important fact is that under the influence of the ideas of perestroika there has been a notable increase in the social activity of all strata of the population. Most of the workers deeply acknowledge their responsibility for the fate of the republic and the entire country.

Today, when individual hostile elements goaded on from abroad have intensified their efforts to turn the natural national feelings of the workers and the young generation into a destructive nationalistic channel, we must do everything possible to elevate our counterpropaganda work to a qualitatively new level. Every communist in the republic must constantly remember this. Moreover, his party duty is to wage an irreconcilable battle with any statements made against the friendship and fraternity of peoples of all nationalities in our Homeland. Perestroika, which touches upon all the segments of party work, has also touched upon the work with the faithful. A year ago the CPSU Central committee subjected us to strict criticism for shortcomings in our atheistic work. The republic's party organization has drawn certain conclusions from this criticism. However, not all of the party organizations are yet conducting skillful atheistic work under conditions of democratization and glasnost. The continued adherence to the principle of freedom of conscience, the overcoming of primitivism and administrative-bureaucratic style—these are the basics of reorganizing atheistic work.

We have touched upon only a few of the spheres which require intensification in the ideological-training work of the party organizations. However, this already clearly testifies to how important it is today to everywhere

provide an innovative, deeply creative, and at the same time principled approach to the solution of crucial problems in increasing the effectiveness of party influence on the consciousness and behavior of the people.

The community today presents many questions related to the most varied spheres: economics and politics, ecology and national relations, and the material and cultural level of life. Some of these questions are more specific, while others bear even a global character. The party workers and all our ideological cadres must study these questions in depth. They must bravely intervene in life and persistently master the art and culture of leading discussions.

CPSU Central Committee Politburo Member and Secretary A. N. Yakovlev comes to the podium.

Speech by A.N. Yakovlev

Comrades! Man has an inherent, almost everyday, need to ponder, to analyze how he lived yesterday, what awaits him today, and what he should do to live better tomorrow. At the social level this property is running late by several decades. Honest and open interpretation of our everyday life in connection with the times has returned to our social consciousness only with April of 1985.

The first 3 years of perestroika were a period which was unusually saturated in a spiritual sense. The winds of renewal, both political and intellectual, have touched upon all aspects of life and swept over the entire country. At the initiative of the party, the most difficult questions have been raised and analyzed in a frank and honest manner.

Society has responded to the party's Leninist directness and openness in an interested and fervent manner. I am convinced that future historians who characterize the current state of society will write of the unusual dynamism and multi-colored nature of the processes which are taking place, of the daring nature of social thought and the extraordinary nature of our plans. The people have shaken off their torpor, straightened up, breathed freely and started talking in full voice about their pressing problems which had accumulated and which had been in the zone of silence for many long years.

Here and there, situations began to arise which deprived certain persons of their spiritual comfort. This evoked concern, and sometimes even panic, primarily due to the newness of such situations. To console ourselves, to say that everything is going along as it should, that these are "vestiges," would mean to subject ourselves to ruinous self-deception, to partition ourselves off from life with a fence of old-style thinking.

In essence, we have only just touched upon the necessary transformations, only reconciled ourselves with them, only defined our very first approaches. However, we have already sensed the complexity and the grandiose nature of the tasks, the might of the accumulated inertia, the force of conservative resistance, the dogmatism, and the bustling avant-gardism.

We should not expect any easy victories.

The intensive spiritual labor of the party and the people is today embodied in the resolutions of the 27th CPSU Congress and the 19th All-Union Conference, as well as the party Central Committee Plenums, an entire series of which are unprecedented in importance over the course of many decades.

It is embodied in the practical endeavors which will define, today this is undoubtedly clear, the fate of our country and the fate of socialism for a long time to come. It is democratization and glasnost, economic and political reform, reorganization of the party itself and of its activity.

The embodiment of this labor is also the increased maturity of society, the party, and each of us. We have all become wiser during these years. Self-deception in the past which we still remember all too well gave rise to cynicism and all-permissiveness. The complications from these illnesses are still apparent even today. Truth and respect for people give rise to responsibility, a healthy attitude toward life, and most importantly—a respect for human labor.

We have begun a great endeavor which demands both great endurance and goal-oriented will. No, not everything is going smoothly. Yes, perestroika gives rise to its own inertia, its own antagonisms. The contradictory nature of events is a testimony to and at the same time a stimulant for their viability. I am speaking of this not for the sake of philosophical self-consolation, but for a practical clarification of the real state of affairs. Without flirting with the obvious, we have the right to affirm that perestroika in 3 years has won the trust of the people not only by the engrossing force of its ideas, but also by specific deeds.

The fate of perestroika has become the consciously elected fate of millions of people of all nationalities in our country. A convincing testimony of this is the public response which the discussions and documents of the 19th Party Conference received.

The conference worked out a clear program of reconstruction of the base and superstructure. The July Plenum expressed these decisions in the language of immediate practical actions which touch upon all spheres of social existence. Only the active and conscious participation in these actions gives each person the moral right to list himself among the fighters for perestroika, and guarantees historical choice for society on the whole.

In essence, the question still remains on the political agenda: will perestroika move ahead, will it begin to gain speed, will it shine with new ideas, will it secure itself with good results, and will it indeed open new prospects for the development of socialism? Or will it go up in smoke with conservatism of thought and action, will it find itself in an asthmatic state due to pseudo-revolutionary phrases and irresponsible actions?

We might say that perestroika is facing its test for the serious and basic nature of its actions and their correspondence to that which has been proclaimed, for the real tangibility of the reforms associated with it.

I.

Today, when the April line has left over 3 years behind it, the question arises as to its effectiveness. The party has something to answer to this question, despite the fact that the consequences of the time of stagnation continue their destructive work. It is a hundred times more difficult to solve problems than to create them. The most obvious example is the Afghan problem. The decision to send Soviet troops to Afghanistan was made and implemented quickly, yet the creation of conditions for returning our sons required and will still require long and complex work.

Let us take another problem which, according to the data of sociologists, is our most acute one. That is the housing problem. In the preceding three five-year plans, the introduction of housing in the country increased by only 7 percent. In the first 2 years of the current five-year plan it increased by 15 percent. As it turns out, with the beginning of perestroika we had the same increase in introduction of housing in one year as we had in the previous 15. The change is obvious, but specifically in this example we see what great problems there are facing us. To 2 million apartments which were introduced annually before, we have added 200,000-300,000 more. However, there are tens of millions of people in need of improved housing conditions.

Economists know that in the current five-year plan the conditions of reproduction are more complex than in the preceding one. The possibilities for growth of employment, expansion of obtaining cheap raw materials, and construction of new enterprises—all the so-called extensive sources of economic growth—have come to a minimal level specifically since the start of the 12th Five-Year Plan. And, if the degree of effectiveness of social production had not changed, even those low growth rates which were present in the last five-year plan would not have been retained. The stagnant economy moved toward losing the capacity not only toward expanded, but even toward simple reproduction. This would have been a crisis. The turn to perestroika stopped this slippage and curtailed the deterioration of the general situation which had been going on for about 15 years.

This is not yet the success which we need, but it is the creation of the necessary prerequisites for serious success. Encouraging tendencies have emerged in the development of a number of proportions. There has been a slowing of the growth of unneeded reserves, which have numbed a considerable portion of the national income for three five-year plans in a row. Average construction time has begun to decline, although it is still intolerably high. Probably the most obvious change for the better has occurred in labor productivity. For the first time we have achieved a reduction in the overall number of persons employed in material production and have been able to direct more labor resources to the sectors which have traditionally lagged behind—those in which the economy serves the consumer.

All this is the result of improvement in the system of economic management, as well as the strengthening of discipline, renewal of the management cadres, and improvement of planning. The effect of the radical reform still lies ahead. After all, it only began in the current year. The transitional period will take 3 years, and only in the beginning of the next five-year plan can we hope to see the integral economic management mechanism in action.

However, it is inadmissible to remain for so long in the state of unstable equilibrium which has emerged in the course of the struggle between the forces for renovation of our economy and the forces of stagnant inertia. We must find additional reserves as quickly as possible so as to give the economy a noticeable impulse toward accelerated renovation. After all, unstable equilibrium is dangerous by its very instability. It may rock backward, and in certain segments this is happening.

Let us take the second most acute social problem along with that of housing—that is the saturation of the market with consumer goods. Here too there has been a shift in the last 3 years, especially in the production of certain types of food products, primarily grain, meat and milk. However, the market situation on the whole has not improved. According to the data of specialists on the market conditions, the commodity-monetary equilibrium has even deteriorated, and the buyers feel this. The fact is that it has been specifically in the last 3 years that two supports of the stagnant economy have been undermined. The first was income from the sale of vodka, which was beginning to threaten the health of the people, both physical and moral. The second was the import of consumer goods using profits from the sale of oil.

It so happened that specifically during the years of stagnation there was a leap in world oil prices which was unprecedented in world history. As compared with the 1973 price level, the country received many tens of billions of additional dollars during those years. However, no one can say that our people got rich from this. A fantastic sum slipped away, like water through our fingers, essentially to cover mismanagement and to support the unsuitable structure of production.

We have come to realize the inconsistency of this structure only now, when world oil prices have dropped. We had to strictly limit currency, including also on the import of consumer goods. So it happened that we are working somewhat better than before, but trade appears at least no better.

As we can see, our domestic trade has suffered partially because foreign trade is not firmly based. Yet are we doing much to strengthen it? For decades the main burden of concerns for obtaining hard currency was borne by those who extract oil, gas, gold, iron ore, and lumber. Now we say that we have a backward commodity structure. Yet we have one-fourth of the world's scientific workers and one-fifth of the machine building potential. For a long time industry has complained about the limitation of rights in foreign trade. We gave it these rights: go out independently into the world market and earn the currency. Do the Lithuanian machine builders, instrument makers, or workers in light industry earn much of it today?

An initiative has emerged for introducing republic cost accounting. The 19th Party Conference supported it in its general form. Yet in specific matters we do not yet know what this is. The methodology is just being developed. Considering the higher labor productivity as compared with the average throughout the country, the Prebaltic republics do not look bad in a strict comparison of expenditures and results. It is true, we will have to consider also the higher level of consumption of many products. However, all these are merely quantitative indicators. But what if your partners, the other republics, suggest considering also the qualitative aspect? For example, what about the ability of our tradeable goods to compete on the world market? Oil, gas, and ore, despite the fluctuation in prices, is a currency commodity. VAZ automobiles and Minsk tractors are saleable on the world market. There they take Ivanovo machine tools and Leningrad turbines. But what percentage of the products of Lithuanian industry is competitive today? What can we make competitive tomorrow? I am afraid that by far not every republic has studied its own economy from these positions.

New approaches are needed in all spheres. We need to literally devote our entire economy to an x-ray examination of new requirements. You know about the measures for accelerating commodity growth, particularly that of food products and paid services. But why must we limit ourselves to one side of the balance in the struggle for commodity-monetary equilibrium? After all, we can not only increase the influx of goods to the market, but also reduce the influx of unsecured funds. For this we must draw the limits of waste by sectorial ministries who spend funds on a non-cost accounting basis—funds from the state budget which are viewed as "not belonging to anyone."

This is particularly apparent in the sphere of capital investments. We are undertaking many construction projects which we are unable to bring to their conclusion.

We are building many projects which can be put off to the future. In order to eliminate this practice, we must be more decisive in transferring capital investments over to a cost accounting basis and more strict in economizing on budget funds. Credit must take on primary positions. The 19th Party Conference spoke the truth when it said that we have a shortage in the state budget, while the July Plenum of the Central Committee adopted a specific program for reducing this deficit, starting already with next year. We must put an end to all types of waste. This is in the interests of every Soviet citizen.

And cannot we engage more actively not only in the effectiveness of production, but also in the effectiveness of distribution and consumption? Let us take trade, for example. The workers in trade have managed to convince us that the waiting lines in stores, which have driven people to desperation, are explained exclusively by the shortage of goods and trade facilities. We, they say, are not at fault. The fault lies, they say, with industry, agriculture, and construction. Yet the people can see what an untruth this is. Our trade managers form up lines even for goods which are not in short supply. They eagerly close down cash-operation trade squares—for repair, for accounting, or simply for no reason at all. Yet there is in Lithuania, in Klaypeda, many years of experience in cultured trade. This experience has taken on all-union renown, but we cannot see that it is being widely emulated. We see no changes in trade even now, when it supposedly has changed over to the new system of economic management. Since the buyer does not see the changes—that means that there is something wrong with the system. That means that for someone it is still more profitable to have a waiting line and a shortage than to have civilized trade. That means someone is still hiding the old ways behind the loud proclamations of perestroika.

II.

Perestroika is justly associated with the honest and complete understanding of the past. I must stress the words honest and complete. The public demand for scientific historical consciousness is dictated, I believe, by a minimum of three reasons.

First of all, it is dictated by the current needs of social practice. Only on the basis of history and through history can we answer the question: what are we trying to get away from and where do we want to go in the process of perestroika?

What is it that hinders us the most, the strongest of all, today?

It is all-pervasive, ever-adapting bureaucratism. It is the habit of living life by inertia, with personal and social irresponsibility, and without initiative. It is endeavors which remain only in thoughts, decisions which go no farther than the paper they are written on, thoughts which once were alive but have long since been cast into

dogmas and frozen in them. Also woven into these obstructions is the universal "what if something comes of it," this height of dependent "wisdom."

October of 1917 was managed differently, and socialism in our country and in the world did not begin by instructional paragraphs. To fully emancipate the potential possibilities of socialism, to eliminate everything that slows it down and hinders its development means primarily to understand how we ended up in the trap of stagnation, what actions or inaction dragged us into it. That is why in the process of perestroika we are so attentive, so particular about our past, why we strive to get to know it better and to truly understand it.

The 20th Congress condemned the cult of personality, but left its heritage almost untouched. Just as it did the sources which gave rise to the cult, everything that preserved and promulgated it, everything that was born of it in practice, in the consciousness and in the souls of the people. It was specifically because this cult of personality was not properly studied at that time or defined as a specific social phenomenon, our society subsequently turned out to be unprepared for understanding and effectively counteracting its various consequences. Its spiritual and practical legacy was in fact able to become entrenched, changing its face but retaining its essence. That is what holds us today, pulls us back, and tries to return us to the times and the circumstances of stagnation.

We must not confuse, much less equate, the negative superimpositions of Stalinism with such lofty phenomena and concepts as heroism and selflessness of the people, enthusiasm and unselfishness of the groundbreakers and founders, with the incomparable spiritualized idealism of the revolution which was based on the highest scientific knowledge of its time and on the moral purity of revolutionary thought.

On the contrary, we must ask ourselves: how did it happen that specifically everything that was the most leading, honest and conscientious, the most Leninist in our socialism became the primary object and victim of repression? How did it happen that the wonderful qualities born of the revolution were in many ways lost, in many ways devaluated by the subsequent practice? To what degree is there subjective guilt and responsibility here, and to what degree is this a manifestation of some objective processes which are far from fully known and understood.

Only when we have understood all this will we fulfill our moral duty to the founders of socialism, its hero workers and hero defenders, and to our descendants. Only in this case will we be able to protect ourselves against relapses of the cult disease, since it is specifically this germ which lies at the basis of the command-administrative system. A person contaminated with it is socially frightening and dangerous, and the higher his position in society, the more grave the consequences may be.

Whatever sphere we take—economics, the political system, ideology, culture, national relations, or any other—we inevitably encounter obstructions and problems left over from the past. This legacy is like a tight knot with many ends sticking out of it. We understand that we cannot cut it, but must untangle it instead. Only after we have eliminated the very basis of the cult tendencies will we be able to finally deal with the deep-seated consequences of the national drama which has befallen our people and our revolution. Yet this is a gigantic task which will require all our will, all our spiritual and moral effort, and colossal goal orientedness.

Secondly, the need for knowledge and understanding of the past is dictated also by moral reasons. We have begun to overcome many negative phenomena and processes which have become too widespread in our life. We have done quite a lot in this respect. Yet this is still only a beginning. Without removing personal responsibility from each person for his own words and deeds, we as Marxists and communists must analyze also the social roots of amorality, irresponsibility and other anti-social tendencies. These roots lie in the past. They lie in the historical past, in the nature and structure of that old world which we have left, never to return. But they also lie in our own past as well. We have already understood that the miscalculations in socialist construction, the distortions and deviations which occurred here, are capable of bringing to life and even strengthening and developing those genes of anti-humanism which are found in the spiritual legacy of man.

You all know the articles and speeches whose authors sound the alarm, maintaining that a truthful evaluation of the past disarms the youth, that glasnost has exceeded rational boundaries, that an attack on principles is going on under cover of this glasnost. They say we should not remember the repressions and tragic mistakes.

Neither from a practical, nor from a political, nor from a moral standpoint can we justify the efforts to hide our heads in the sand, to shirk from analysis and avoid measures which would protect us against a repetition of the tragedy of the past. The main thing is that we must arm with knowledge and with moral strength to overcome the consequences which have remained both in society and in the souls of the people. This is because, if the national drama was so large-scale, if it touched millions of people and lasted for decades, then its consequences will be on just as large-scale, just as all-pervasive and just as prolonged. They cannot be overcome elementally, but only with a conscious and goal-oriented policy.

A frank and honest approach to history—that is our achievement, since it testifies to the spiritual force and maturity of society. The weak live by myths, and the ignorant feed on legends.

No, as yet there are no answers which are exhaustive in fullness and depth of analysis to the numerous questions associated with our history. And there will not be, unless we seek them out. The doors are currently open for such a search in science, as well as in art and in publicistics. M. S. Gorbachev has repeatedly spoken about this. This was also mentioned at the 19th Party Conference. The Politburo commission on additional investigation of the matters of the 30-40's and early 50's is also looking into this.

Thirdly, attention to the past is dictated also by the demand of social justice. The matter here is not simply that without this justice there cannot be progress in socialism. Without social justice, even the normal life of society, a healthy economy, open and strong social ties, and a strong family would be impossible.

The decision to build a monument in Moscow to the victims of repression has become an act of human dignity and political justice. You all know what kind of a reaction this decision evoked from the conference and from all the people.

We must clearly understand that truth about the past is our compass to the future. If we do not have enough courage to interpret the path we have travelled, we will encounter many difficulties ahead. Filling in the "gaps" in history is a difficult and bitter task. It requires clean hands, uncompromising morality, and high scientific objectivity, and does not admit vanity. Historical memory is multidimensionally joined with our affairs today and our hopes for the future.

III.

It is principally important—and this was demonstrated by the party conference—that perestroika is leaning ever more heavily on the stirred society, on the awakened conscience, on the initiative and interest of the masses, and on their active civil position.

The preparation, course and resolutions of the conference, that public resonance which it received, were a form of vote of confidence in public trust of perestroika. The weighty political mandate which the party received under conditions of unprecedented glasnost must serve as the impetus for a responsible, brave and decisive movement toward the outlined goals.

This is especially true if there is a good stockpile. You, as far as I am aware, have just that.

The socio-economic problems are being solved in Lithuanian not in the worst way. One might even say they are being solved with comparative success. The increase in the national income in the republic comprised 5.3 percent last year, while the plan called for 4 percent. The plan assignments for the production of grain and consumer goods, for retail commodity turnover, for the volume of realization of paid services, and

for the operational introduction of housing were all overfulfilled. The plans for introduction of schools, preschool institutions and hospitals were fulfilled. All these are important parameters of the prosperity of man's social living environment.

Much is being done to constantly increase the scientific and cultural potential of the republic. Although the creative intelligentsia have their own questions—and these you must deal with yourselves—nevertheless the republic's party and state management even in difficult times did much to see that science and culture developed normally in the republic, so that the people in the creative arts did not have the feeling that they were not needed or that their work was not necessary. They gratefully remember even today Antanas Sniechkus, who did very much for the all-union and international authority of the republic.

We remember the glory won in the 60's by Mezhelaitis's poem "Man," the monument by Iokubonis, "Grieving Mother," the Zhalakyavichyus film "No One Wanted to Die." In the 70's the country got to know the honest and deep prose of Avizhyus, the philosophical poems and plays of Martsinkyavichyus. They opened Miltinis Theatre in Panevezhis, and Banenis became a most popular Soviet actor. In the 80's the Lithuanian Chamber Orchestra and its conductor Sondetskis gained all-union recognition, and the star of fame of the young director Nekroshyus rose. During all these years, Lithuanian architects worked in a talented and persistent manner, and were rightly awarded the State Prize, and in 1988—the Lenin Prize. And although evidently there are some complaints expressed regarding some of the current building and its integration with historical buildings, as there are complaints everywhere, nevertheless this matter here is formulated much better than it is in other regions of the country. This is true also for the multi-year planned work on restoration of architectural monuments.

All this creates a stable and positive reputation for Lithuanian culture, whose representatives are greeted in any city, in any republic of our country, with sincere liking and respect.

Lithuania also has an extensive scientific potential. Specifically well-known are the achievements in the sphere of microelectronics and heart surgery. The major, bright personalities of the organizers of production who have mastered the current art of management, also speak today of the republic's intellectual potential. In short, there is no sphere of life in which Soviet Lithuania has not shown itself.

You might ask: Does the republic need perestroika in this case? Is there something to reorganize? I believe it does and there is. You see this yourselves. The republic is not free of problems which are inherent to society and to the country's national economy. There is also an entire series of specific questions which have not found

resolution for a long time. Finally, we must also recognize the fact that leadership in certain questions inevitably leads to tasks of the next level. The dialectics of the resolved and the forthcoming is in effect everywhere—in the scope of the country, the republic, and in each labor collective.

But the main thing is that we must all go from the good to the best. The republic also has its reserve of unsolved problems. In 1987 there were 30,500 apartments built, but 35,000 young families were formed. Yet there are also those on the waiting list, as well as an emergency fund, which in the last 2 years has practically not declined. It is comprised of 67,500 people. Altogether there are almost 144,000 families on the waiting list for receiving housing area. There are other problems as well. One of them is insufficient provision of children's pre-school institutions. Twelve percent of the school children attend school during the second session, and in large cities this percentage is even higher, and is showing a tendency toward growth.

Thus, the tasks of a turnaround in management of the social sphere and in human needs are present also in Lithuania. This is a question not only of practical work, its organization and effectiveness. In the situation of democratization, glasnost, increase in public activity and initiative this is also a question of political life.

Among the achievements of the first years of perestroika we may today also name the following: the renovation has returned politics to us. V. I. Lenin said that politics begins when millions of people act. Administration and commanding left only executive functions for the millions. Perestroika applauds initiative. It recognizes and stimulates multiplicity of opinions and interests and seeks means and methods for their optimal definition and accounting. This is what comprises the political process.

We must speak about this already today in a definite manner. The reconstruction of the political system of Soviet society, the resolution of which was adopted by the party conference, concerns not only the structure of the organs of power, the division of functions or the order of elections. It directly signifies also the resurrection of the political process in the country, without which all these good and necessary innovations will not work.

The experience of 3 years irrefutably convinces us that the political provision of perestroika, of new forms and methods of work, of each specific endeavor and deed—is necessary, significant, and in some cases even the main portion of the work. This is especially true now, when we have entered the stage of practical matters, when the fate of perestroika will in essence be resolved.

That means we must learn politics. Not simply democracy, culture of glasnost, or discussion, but also politics as a specific sphere of activity. We must consider its

regularities, its rules and its logic. If perestroika is measured in deeds, then the effectiveness of its political provision is measured in the realism of the goals and maturity of the actions of each party organization. This is what comprises its fighting nature under current conditions.

We must remember that any misstep, even if it is subjectively colored in tones of good intentions, plays into the hands of the enemies of perestroika, hinders this process whose completion will give every person, wherever he lives, every Soviet society on the whole, much greater material and spiritual well-being, democratic freedom and creative capacities than the expending of energy on acute but not first-priority problems.

The adoption of the resolution "On international relations" by the All-Union Party Conference evoked the following questions. What happened in our common house, where not that long ago, it seems, there was nothing to hint at unrest?

Democratization, glasnost, pluralism of opinions, and the emerging polyphony illuminated the unresolved aspects of national relations which had been accumulating, had been ignored, and were cast aside for decades. However, it was they that created also the necessary conditions for democratically overcoming these ills. In essence, the first major step in the theoretical and practical substantiation of national policy in the period of perestroika was made by the 19th Party Conference.

Today a broad, comprehensive interpretation of the entire set of these problems has begun with the widespread participation of the community. The necessity for renovating legislation on these questions is already clear (also with the broad participation of the people), as is the need for introducing the appropriate changes and supplements to the USSR Constitution and the constitutions of the union and autonomous republics. Ultimately, we must have a sound legal basis for international relations.

The idea of unification of any and all—economics, architecture, forms and ways of life and much else—has turned out to be extremely harmful under our conditions. It is akin to levelling, and proceeds from the same bureaucratic desire toward triumph of synonymy, uniformity, and like-mindedness. Yet the country is varied. The people and nations in it are different, and their equality can in no way be reduced to synonymy. On the contrary, it is specifically unification, which outwardly makes everyone supposedly equal, that in fact hurts and insults everyone without exception.

A person objectively belongs to a certain national community. From this stems his desire to transfer to national relations his understanding of his socio-political and cultural existence. This is understandable. It is impossible to separate a man's social and national affiliation, and there is no reason to do so. Moreover, we must keep

in mind that we cannot cross out the tragic pages of past conflicts from a nation's historical memory. The twists and distortions in social and national policy allowed during the period of the cult of personality, in the years of stagnation, are superimposed over an even more remote past, and are capable of reanimating it.

Even the largest of the republics, the Russian Federation, feels itself infringed upon somewhere. Take, for example, the state of the social-cultural sphere in the cradle of Russia—Novgorod, Pskov, Vladimir and Yaroslavl oblasts. Also, the economic situation in many regions of Russia evokes serious concern.

There is much ideological-theoretical confusion here. For example, many party documents, as well as the USSR Constitution, state the position that a new historical, social and international community of people has been formed in our country—the Soviet people. The conclusion seems to be correct. However, taken in combination with the thesis about the inevitable merging of nations, this position is perceived as an attack on the national and an effort to level it.

In speaking of the merging of nations, we often referred to V. I. Lenin, although he wrote about something else—about the merging of the interests of nations in a socialist society. As for national and national-state differences, they, in Lenin's opinion, will be retained for a very long time to come, even after the victory of socialism on a world scale.

Of course, we cannot approach this concept, as well as reality itself, metaphysically. We are speaking of development, and not of a finished process. Who can know today what unexpected occurrences history is preparing for us tomorrow? Look at the integration processes in Western Europe, in a region which has been torn apart for centuries by national strife. In other words, this position requires deep scientific development, and from the party aktiv it demands well thought-out and convincing positions.

The painful perception of many economic problems is closely tied with the contradictory effect of economics on international relations. We must admit that this circumstance is still being ignored by the ministries and departments. At times they do not become involved responsibly enough in the sphere of habitation of the peoples and objectively push the migration processes. However, can we consider the desire for self-isolation, for a tearing away of the economy of a certain republic from the country's unified national economic complex, to be an adequate response?

I hope I will not upset anyone present if I say that the appeals which are reduced essentially to the creation of some kind of reservations, to isolationism in economic and spiritual life, seem strange in the very least. The unreality of such a formulation consists of its contradiction to all of our socialist experience and the objective

tendencies of world development as a whole. It consists of the irrationality, the dead-end variant, from the point of view of development, of the progress which it suggests.

Man is formed, grows up, reaches the heights of labor and creativity not in solitude, but in communication and interaction with other people, in society.

In the same way, any people, society or country expose their potential and go forward only through cooperation and exchange with other peoples. And where but in our multinational socialist state, a real international universe, are there better initial prerequisites created for this?

Another matter is the question of improving such cooperation and developing its legal basis and organizational forms. It is the question of the greater independence of all its participants and their greater mutual responsibility. And, of course, it is a question of equal, equivalent economic exchange. We still have much intensive work to perform in all these directions. Perestroika has already begun this work.

The problem of national languages has become particularly acute in certain regions.

One writer once said: "Isn't it a paradox: I know three national languages—and I am a nationalist. Yet the person who calls me that knows one—Russian, even though he has lived in the republic for several decades. Yet he—is an internationalist!"

We must introduce very strict rules in linguistic policy regarding the use of the national language in the national republics which are part of our Union, and we must check on these rules most thoroughly. We must show constant concern for the active functioning of the national languages in various spheres of state, social and cultural life. We must encourage the study of the language whose name the republic bears by all citizens of other nationalities living in that republic.

Obviously, all this should not contradict either the democratic principle of free selection of the language of instruction, or the established tendency toward the development of national-Russian bilingualism. We must prepare and submit for broad discussion an outline of a union law on the free development and equal-rights use of languages of the USSR peoples.

One of the facts of our existence is the growth of national self-consciousness. This is a regular process, but it never proceeds simply. Rather, it reflects and diffracts all the turns of real life. And under the effect of its problems and difficulties, especially those which remain unsolved and which get worse as time goes along, this process may also take on unhealthy forms. It is specifically in these cases that there may be outbursts of uncontrolled emotions and irrational principles cast into politics and social life.

Yet the matter here is not one of national self-consciousness as such. The matter is in those objective primary reasons that caused a rather broad and basically legitimate dissatisfaction of the people. These are phenomena of different levels. If only because national self-consciousness is but a part of social consciousness. Normally this part can develop only together with the healthy development of the whole.

Social consciousness today is marked by a critical approach to reality and to our own acts. This is a healing directionality also for national self-consciousness. The capacity of a people for self-criticism is a testimony to its spiritual maturity and freedom. We always lack such a capacity. We are still only approaching the ideology of freedom and its moral code.

Today it is considered "good manners" to defend the national against foreign influence. Yet a testimony to national wisdom and maturity of self-consciousness is the defense against our own shortcomings, as well as self-analysis and self-recognition. Is national self-consciousness reduced only to the pride of belonging to one nation or another? We must be careful not to follow the path of competition in terms of price. We must be careful not to subordinate reason to irrational feelings. I believe that not one aspect of life—either social or individual—can be given over to feelings alone. Where we exclude reason—there exclude also responsibility.

The conference spoke out with great force in favor of the international socialist brotherhood of peoples. We are speaking essentially of internationalism not only as a political, but also as a moral category, an all-national and all-human value. It is at this height that communists hold such human manifestations as brotherhood, kindness, openness, decency, and capacity to understand and to come to one's aid, patience, a sense of commonality of fate, and joint responsibility for the future. On the all-human scale of values, altruism is always given preference over egoism—whether individual or group.

IV.

I have often had occasion to hear from respected members of science and art—both in our country and abroad—a most positive evaluation of the position presented by M. S. Gorbachev regarding the priority of the humanitarian over the class in current world politics, under conditions when the problem of mankind's survival has come to the forefront. And also regarding the possibility of extrapolating it to various aspects of life, including also to international relations.

In reality, the entire world today is moving toward unity, toward integrity, removing all that hinders it—racism, wars, terrorism, and national exclusiveness. Need we say that this integration process is painfully complex, dramatic and contradictory? However, this is its tendency. Today there has been an unusual increase in the value of the courage of responsibility not only for oneself and for

one's people, but also for the fate of the human community, for the world in its entirety. This increases the importance of internationalism, whose pioneers in the 19th century were the communists. It was during a period when capitalism barricaded itself in national quarters. Today internationalization has encompassed the entire planet and all the social systems.

In implementing perestroika, we cannot help but relate it to the processes taking place in the world. The fact is not only that our domestic development is closely and directly tied with the world situation, or that the threat of nuclear catastrophe, the arms race or confrontation have not yet been eliminated.

The root of this question is that socialism was born and developed on the most acute theory and practice of civilization as a whole. Scientific socialism as a theory is the result of the interpretation of the entire pre-socialist road of mankind, and all of its experience. Socialism as a practice is the science and the art of considering in deed all the newest traditions of economics, politics, science, and culture, both in one's own country and abroad.

Today, when socialism has prepared itself for deep and radical self-renewal, when new foundations of life are being laid for decades to come, we again turn to the theory and practice of world development, now not only socialist, but non-socialist as well. We turn to it to understand what our world will be like in the foreseeable future, what tasks it will place before us, what possibilities it will open up, what criteria it will present to measure ourselves against in various spheres of life, and what dangers it might create.

The new political thinking gives answers to many questions. What is more important, it gives a current methodology of understanding world development on the eve of the 21st century, a participation in it and an effect on it in an ennobling and humanistic direction. Both by its content and by its methodology, the new political thinking continues and creatively develops the appropriate positions of scientific socialism and communist ideology.

What is most important here for us from a practical standpoint?

First of all, it is the new interpretation of the highest ideals and values of socialism as applied to the peculiarities of the present day. The liberation of the working man from the supremacy of private ownership must inevitably begin with his liberation from all types of exploitation and oppression. This is axiomatic. However, this is only the first step in turning civilization into the true kingdom of the working man. Today we see in our own experience and understand how many other steps must still be taken, how much is still to be implemented so as to really arrive at a society of social justice.

We also see that the movement toward such an ideal does not take place in a single moment. The notions of the world revolution as something strongly concentrated in time, like analogous notions about the facility and automatism of the latter movement toward socialism and communism, have proven their utopian nature and their inconsistency. The efforts to straighten out the historical road of the peoples, even though dictated, possibly, by the best of intentions, bear a high cost.

Today it is clear: The transition to socialism even on the scale of an individual country is a long historical process which has its own regularities and stages. This presents the task of searching for the optimal means and forms of passing through this process, the most adequate policy. This in turn presents the task of recognizing the fact that not only the end goal of the movement, but also the means and methods which it utilizes, every step along this path, must answer to the ideals and principles of socialism and not enter into intentional or unintentional contradiction with the ultimate goal. This means a minimum of outlays and a maximum of effectiveness. This is the highest criterion of socialist nature.

Preventing the nuclear threat, disarmament in the name of peace, trust and cooperation in the name of security and survival of mankind—these are the primary tasks of the present day. However, if we think in historical categories, this is only the very first, the most necessary prerequisite for allowing people to begin a fair, democratic, and rational solution of their problems. We must also feed the hungry and save the natural environment of the planet, without which we cannot live. We must employ the far from endless Earth resources in a prudent manner. We must prepare and implement a large-scale economic outcome of mankind to the World Ocean and into space, without which if not we, then our children and grandchildren, will not be able to survive.

That is how the task is formulated. However, let us turn it another way. Who will be the first to pay if all this or the most important elements of what we have listed above will not be fulfilled? It is clear from history that all the difficulties and deprivations, all the sacrifices and all the load will fall primarily on the fate of the simple people of the planet, the working people.

All-human interests are not an abstract category deduced speculatively by the thinker suspended in his office. In our time, when the entire planet, it seems, has shrunk to a size smaller than it has ever been, when the fate and history of mankind may be cut short by pressing a button, when any event becomes the property of 5 billion people in just a few hours—in this time all-human interests have taken on flesh and blood.

These really are the interests of all mankind. This means that they are our interests too, since we are a part of mankind and one of the most important factors of its social progress. These are interests which unify mankind, and this means they are capable of overcoming the forces

of disunification, contradiction, confrontation, and war, interests which have already found their development in civilization for centuries. This is the case when opposites are joined: the interests of a person are merged with the interests of all people, a philosophical, abstract and all-historical category merges with the strictly practical, down-to-earth, real, and everyday.

Marxism as such is an interpretation of all-people's interests from the standpoint of history and the prospects of development of all mankind, and not only its individual countries or classes, peoples or social groups. Placing in the forefront the interests of the oppressed and the exploited, isolating in the social structure of its time a class—the bearer of the historical mission of liberating man and mankind, can we say that the founders of socialism juxtaposed these interests to everything else? No, of course not.

They isolated and strived to achieve the objective tendencies of social development. They predicted where and at what stage this development would suit the man who was not simply prudent, but also humane and humanitarian, and defined what could be done to accomplish this, and how. They asked the question of how to change and transform the world so that mankind would move toward social progress, humanism, light and freedom not through catastrophes and crises, not through wars and tyranny, not by the all too expensive method of trial and error on living people, but rather through the force of reason, scientific foresight, and constructive labor.

The thesis on the priority of all-human values is valuable in that it grasps the objective tendency of development. It also calls for a rejection of a dogmatic view of the world, one's own country, and every national group. It helps to realistically and sanely look at the idea of coexistence of countries with different political systems as a dictate of history, as a manifestation of the internationalistic tendency of world development. We remember the thesis of Marx that the end goals of the struggle of the proletariat coincide with the tasks of development of world civilization.

The liberation of man and mankind from all types of exploitation and oppression, the struggle against the nuclear threat and for the salvation of civilization, the active inclusion of socialism in the solution of other all-human, global problems—these are not different or contradictory tasks. Rather, they are mutually augmenting. These are merely different facets, different component parts, different aspects of the same path: the path to freedom and progress of peoples.

I believe that the theoretical breakthroughs in recent years allow us to raise to a higher level not only our own understanding of the dialectics of the all-human and the class-related, but also the dynamics of the international and national.

Nationalism begins when national exclusiveness is cultivated, when the interests of one's own people are juxtaposed to the interests of other peoples, when the spiritual ties between nations are limited or broken. Nationalism is not only blind. It is also antihumanistic. It seeks enemies, not friends. It confronts, not unites. It ignores all-human values.

If we speak of our country, then the essence of the serious threat of national self-consciousness growing into national egoism, into a sense of national exclusiveness, is not present. Here we should not fall into unjustified fuss in our evaluations. There are too many things tying our peoples, their history and current situation, their economy and culture together for the people to cease feeling these ties as a value. On the contrary, the elimination of the bureaucratic-command style of management, of ignorance and complacency on the way toward renovation of society will lead to a strengthening of socialist unity of the nations and peoples. Only together can we free ourselves of our common misfortunes. If we try to do so alone, then our dead end is ensured.

To lead society means primarily to have a good understanding of the essence and sense of the processes going on in it, and to correctly react to them. It would be a big mistake for the ruling party to stand aside from that which is going on or to take the position of only a counteracting force. The task consists of seeing that any objectively determined movements in socialist society take on a constructive character. The national factor can and must become one more motivating force in perestroika. For this we must learn to correctly evaluate national feelings and not leave the growth of national self-consciousness to the whims of fate.

True patriotism is a mighty force. To speculative pseudo-patriotism we must contrapose active and all-seeing patriotism, and elevate its prestige in public opinion. Recognized love for one's people is incompatible with national seclusion, hatred and prejudice against other peoples and cultures, and efforts to belittle their honor and dignity. The flourishing of a nation presupposes the creative assimilation of all that is best from what has been developed by mankind, as well as the capacity to offer other nations something valuable from its own experience. In other words, true patriotism always leads to internationalism and to a narrowing of all-people's interests.

I believe it would not be excessive to remember the words of the wonderful poet and classic of Soviet Literature, Eduardas Mezhalaytis: "To isolate oneself is dangerous both for an individual person and for a people. We might also add: for a large and small person, as well as for a large and small people. It is equally dangerous for all, and all are threatened by spiritual anemia. The spirit receives little nourishment. It has nothing to sustain itself, and it begins to suffocate, like a fish under a thick layer of ice where there is not enough oxygen. Oxygen, cultural oxygen, is necessary to the spirit."

V.

Comrades! Today it is clear to us that we must develop socialism not with the aid of new administrative measures imposed on a rapidly growing society, but only by means of the goal-oriented, well thought out, and continued exposure of all the possibilities for showing the initiative and creativity of the people.

This presupposes a return to the Leninist ideal of socialism, to its truly democratic and humanistic face, a purification of all deformations and distortions of the past. It is also a forward movement, from the 20th century to the 21st century, and not to the phantasmagoric past.

In short—it is an exposure of the true and as yet unrealized potential of socialism, a return of its self-motivating energy, its revolutionary initiative, its force of historical example.

One of the most important directions for the rebirth of the socialist ideal and at the same time for giving internal energy to the stagnant social organism is the return to Man. To Man "as a goal, and not as a means," as Marx said.

In essence this means to restore trust in common sense of the individual person, who needs no prodding to develop the socialist society which his fathers defended at the price of their lives and in whose flourishing he himself and his children have a vital interest.

The most reliable and only support of the socialist order can only be a person in the entire fullness of his inalienable natural rights—the rights of the individual, of the collective, of national, regional and social groups. Yet there are also responsibilities, and not only to the state, but also to society, to those with whom the person lives and works, and finally—to himself. Man is a resource of the community, a pillar of its support. And when he realizes only himself and does not show any interest in socially beneficial activity, society must ask itself the question: Why is this happening? But it must also present its demands to the person.

Stemming from this is the need for decisive democratization of the life of society: the creation of conditions for the participation of the broadest strata of the population; broad glasnost in everything concerning the content and methods of work of the management mechanism; instilling political and legal culture of society. Related to this are: respect and patience for someone else's opinion or different thought, prohibition on banning or encouraging all shades of thought and talent and various forms of their competition, comparison, or discussion with only one condition—the aim toward the common good and toward social progress.

The 19th Party Conference has taken a firm course toward building a legal state. This means a deep-seated reform of the political system by means of its comprehensive democratization. This is a movement toward a socialist self-governing society based on law.

People with full rights, authoritative government and unbendable law—these are the pillars of support for a legal socialist state. We must reject the thought of the unconditional primacy of the state over law, the "absolutization" of the state, which supposedly gives rights to the people as gifts. We must eliminate this paternalistic psychology which deforms legal consciousness, infringes upon the dignity of man, and cultivates qualities which are far from the best.

It is correct to say that a lawful society is a society in which everything that is not prohibited by law is permitted. However, this formula may work perfectly only under certain conditions.

First of all, it presupposes the presence of a branched and well thought out system of laws adequate to the demands of social development. As yet we do not have this. The Conference and the July Plenum of the Central Committee have developed a specific schedule of work on this matter. It is important only that the process of developing the legislation for purposes of democratization of society be democratic and open in itself.

Secondly, we must see that the laws which have been adopted actually work. A law which is not needed or which is adopted but not implemented promotes contempt for law and order as such. It presents the idea that this law may be manipulated without punishment. These saboteur-laws are the primary enemies of legality.

We must instill in society a respect for the law. We can demand its improvement, but as long as a law is in effect, it must be carried out. Without law there is no democracy. Much of what we encounter today is entirely new in our political practice, and has led some people to confusion. In some places they have again tried to resort to prohibitions, which could not help but introduce even more tension into the situation. However, we are speaking of the citizens' exercising their constitutional rights and freedoms. Here we need not prohibitions, not orders, but clear legal regimentation of what one can and cannot do, the designation of that boundary beyond which the assertion and defense of the rights and freedoms of one person turns out to be an infringement on the rights and freedoms of another.

We cannot contrapose freedom and discipline, democracy and legality, and say—it is either one or the other. That is nothing of the sort. These are dialectical opposites of one and the same phenomenon: a civilized legal socialist society. If there is no discipline, there will also be no freedom. The freedom of one individual will turn

out to an infringement upon the freedom another, unruliness. However, if there is no freedom, there will also be no recognized reliable discipline.

There may also be different types of discipline. There is discipline by the stick, which was taught to slaves and serfs and which often combines external submission to force with a dangerous absence of self control of the individual. Efforts to impose such discipline led to Spartacus, Razin, Pugachev, and to revolutions. In our time they are concluded by mass social apathy. However, such discipline has never promoted progress. An oppressed person is not a creator.

There is also the discipline which stems from the consciousness, from the sense of one's own dignity. It is the discipline of respect for society and for laws, which in turn respect the person and the individual. It is the discipline of respect for another and for oneself. This is the way the discipline of our socialist society can and must be. It is this type of discipline which today is in short supply, but is instilled only through democracy and legality, and not in any other way.

We must stop and think what has led to the efforts to equate freedom and all-permissiveness. There may be many reasons for this. Most probably, their sources may be found in inexperience, in ignorance, and in elementary misinformation. How often does a person who comes into a store or makes use of a service, who appeals to a court or to state agencies, or even a person at his work site have a firm understanding of his specific—and I stress, not "general," but specific rights and responsibilities? An understanding of what is unconditionally prescribed for him in this role, and also what he is unconditionally responsible for doing? How often do people know at meetings, conferences, or in elections and so forth what right they have to act?

I am convinced that is by far not always the case. It is specifically this not knowing which often turns into concepts of all-permissiveness. I believe there is a broad field of activity for informational, propagandist, educational and ideological work. We will perform it, and the people themselves, with greater energy and confidence, with a knowledge of the matter, will be able to handle those who intentionally use the conditions of democratization and glasnost to undermine perestroika or to satisfy their own strictly selfish ambitions.

Much is based here also on certain historical traditions which, we must say, by far not always favor the affirmation of the norms of democratism, tolerance and social psychology. The response here may be only the understanding that democracy is not introduced by decree. Democracy is a long historical process, a path which must be followed for many, many decades. The first setbacks and difficulties along this path are comparable to the first steps of a child. It is a poor mother who does

not watch to see how her child walks. Yet the mother who, fearing bumps and bruises, does not let her child out of her arms or out of the carriage—she is no better.

Legality and democracy must go hand in hand. Democracy without legality actually threatens to become anarchy. However, legality without democracy also leads to arbitrary rule. The proposals to turn off of the path of democracy and glasnost, to turn back, are senseless. We have already been there.

VI.

The 19th Party Conference strengthened the turn in the party's approach to the intellectual and spiritual sphere whose beginnings were laid by the 27th Congress. Revolutionary perestroika, as stated in the conference resolution, is impossible without the comprehensive activation of the intellectual and spiritual potential of society, the growth of the general and political culture of the people. By supporting the multiplicity of endeavors and the creative achievement of the truth, competitiveness, innovation and continuity, the party has expressed its confidence that the creative intelligentsia will respond with active and responsible work for perestroika.

Perestroika began as an intellectual breakthrough. It would have been impossible without the support of the selfless, devoted activity of the civic minded portion of the intelligentsia. We must say this directly. All those who carried out the ideas of perestroika in the stagnant years, who resisted stagnation, all of them were brought up by the revolution, by socialism, and by the party. Perestroika is being carried out in the name of socialism and the implementation of its ideals. How firmly have they entered the culture and psychology of society that no deviations, distortions, deformations or errors have been able to shake them?

Mistrust of the intelligentsia and the presumption of its guilt—this is the legacy which we are rejecting. Here we may speak of many things.

We may say that, probably starting with Daniil the Hermit, and perhaps even earlier, men of letters and scholars always yearned for democracy. That is why they were at odds with the anti-democratic authorities. We may speak of the traditional ties between the intelligentsia and the revolutionary movements; of the struggle which has always gone on within the intelligentsia itself; of its peculiar sense for the new, but also its tendency to fetishize its own views; of its courage, but also of its capacity to "fall into intellectual faint-heartedness and intellectual nervousness," as the great Russian intellectual Lenin once said.

It is generally known that the intelligentsia expresses the self-consciousness of the people. Yet it is not only the expressor, but to a significant degree also the architect of this self-consciousness, the purifier of nations and the utterances of nations. The role is great, and so is the responsibility.

This relates directly and immediately to the creative intelligentsia, to the writers who sensitively and emotionally express the public sentiment. Moreover, in many ways they also formulate the national behavior. And for this we need not only emotional sensitivity, but also the power of intellect and folk wisdom.

In passionate arguments, in the creation of numerous projects, the truth sometimes gets caught between thought and feelings, while the reality of the possibilities fades into the background, giving way to mischievously impudent intentions. The charm of the atmosphere of revolutionary renewal, the temperament of its will and its new forms, sometimes seem to push aside the realism of the people's thinking and negate the value of natural common sense. This occurs even though we know that it is specifically the realism of goals and plans which is one of the guarantees of their implementation.

We also cannot discount our recent experience. Not only expressing, but also stimulating the public sentiments, certain respected representatives of the intelligentsia have bitterly discovered how quickly they have lost control of the situation. They were no longer heeded, and their avant-gardism was already considered to be conservatism. Meanwhile, entirely different people pranced ahead, those who did not think about the consequences and who were ready to propose the newest and most "r-r-revolutionary" slogans. And this was certainly not for the sake of the people, but to retain themselves on the crest of public interest.

Among the intellectuals there are conservative-preservative sentiments, as well as light-minded avant-gardism. There are also arguments between them, which is just as natural. However, the character of these arguments is sometimes reminiscent of internecine strife, a clash between group interests and personal ambitions. Irreconcilable denunciations and painful reactions are today characteristic of many leaders of our modern culture. Yet it is specifically they who should set the example and present a model of moral behavior during arguments. The people especially tend to believe that person whose moral preachings coincide with the morality of his own behavior. Much is being said and printed today which ignites passions and instills suspicion. Yet this is read by millions of people who, whether they want to or not, are forced to take one side or the other, to divide and clash on the battleground of someone else's vanity.

Whom does this benefit? Perestroika? The humane face of socialism? We are not speaking of manifesting indifference to positions. The culture of discussions certainly does not mean shunning an analysis of the views of one's

opponent. However, it eliminates the desire to belittle him, to oppress the dignity of the individual, and to turn creative polemics into a series of trials.

We cannot evade the main point. The purpose of our discussions is the collective search for answers to questions which have been presented by perestroika. The ability to convince and to lead has always been considered an advantage of the avant-garde. We should also not forget party comradeship. Let us remember Lenin. Here is his position: "We cannot write about our party comrades in such language which systematically sows hatred, disgust, contempt, etc. toward those among the working masses who do not agree with us."

Today, after the party conference which has given a great output of new ideas, we must elevate the plane of discussions to such a level of problems where the energy to overcome them will turn out to be stronger than the inertia of separation. Socialist pluralism of opinions is a respectful comparison and an honest argument. It is the struggle of ideas, and not the public defamation of people.

Here we must mention the guarantee of the long-lasting nature of pluralism of opinions. It consists of ensuring "direct representation" of the people and the workers themselves in the public discussion. There have already been definite changes in this direction. Excerpts from letters sent in by readers are perceived sometimes even with greater interest than other materials. The spectrum of opinions is sometimes quite representative. Yet this is only the beginning.

I will remind you of the purposeful comments of M. S. Gorbachev in the course of speeches by party conference delegates regarding the fact that the people must participate in the life of society through the political process and through the opportunity of expressing its point of view and bringing its opinion to all... We must offer the opportunity of expressing different points of view. Then the entire spectrum of sentiments and problems will become clearer, and a solution will arise on this basis.

The participation of the people in public and political life through the expansion of glasnost is a guarantee of the longevity of the socialist pluralism of opinions. Only that is lasting which corresponds to the radical, deep-seated interests of the people.

The freedom of intellectual activity is a great achievement of perestroika. The active incursion of the intelligentsia into public discussions, into the formulation of social projects and political decisions—this is the true gain of socialism. Socialism cannot be non-intellectual, otherwise it would not be socialism. The freedom of spiritual search for the vitalization of intellectual life of the people, for its spiritual enrichment—this is only purpose toward which we should strive.

The February Central Committee Plenum stated that without culture and aside from culture there is no socialism. A spiritually unawakened person is a poor participant in perestroika. A culturally limited leader is a poor work superintendent. Technocratism in politics and economics has dealt a painful blow not only to the ecology, but also to culture. It is particularly unacceptable today, when the functions of the party are changing and when it is called upon to give spiritual and ideological influence, as is befitting the political avant-garde.

We must resurrect the Marxist-Leninist attitude toward the free creativity of professionals in science and the arts and toward the innovative cultural activity of the masses. In general, comrades, the question of culture arises most acutely also in the all-state and all-party scope, when we must strengthen the revolutionary breakthrough and give it the character of irreversibility and self-development. This is the problem that we are solving today.

Perhaps in this connection we should also mention glasnost. On the whole glasnost, as M. S. Gorbachev said, was one of the heroines of the conference. And the main "responder" to glasnost turned out to be the press, even though glasnost in the press is only a part of the sphere of activity of glasnost in the life of Soviet society.

This, in general, is natural. It is specifically the press which has played and is continuing to play the role of the impact force in perestroika. It awakens public consciousness, tears down the bastions of dogmatism and conservatism, oppresses social alienation and apathy, and makes spiritual life richer and more interesting. The press has penetrated into the pores of the economic management and social organism. It has thrown open the gates to history. It has become the nerve of society, the tribune of broad public opinion in whose hearth political reform has matured and the course toward democratization and glasnost has taken on more specific outlines. The press gives the most tangible representation of that which is going on in society.

Obviously, this is not true in equal measure for all newspapers, broadcasts or journals. Nevertheless, it remains a fact that the press has delved deeply. It has discovered such acute and burning questions. It has touched such strings in the souls of the people that all this has been expressed most directly in the social sentiments of society. It is a society in which passions rage and there is an ongoing struggle of opinions and a juxtaposition of positions. It is not surprising that along with the high evaluation given to the press there are also sharp critical comments.

However, what is happening is something that democracy and socialist pluralism of opinions cannot be complete without: the most active proponents of glasnost are themselves being subjected to its mass test. Its right-wingers have also found themselves in the spotlight.

Actually, individual agencies, authors and editors have not been able to avoid superficiality, distortion of the facts, haste and imprecision in their evaluations, cliquishness, and unjustified attacks on the dignity of individuals. This has given rise to a certain caution, to a rebuke of ambitions. Individual irresponsible articles and conclusions, nihilistic evaluations, hypertrophized judgements about what is going on have given additional motives to those who do not accept glasnost. We must agree with such criticism, comrades, no matter how hurtful it may seem to some of us.

However, one other thing is true. In many cases a negative attitude toward the means of mass information reflects not so much its real or imagined "sins" as the rejection of glasnost itself by the critic. This feeds also on the conservatism of thought which has not yet been overcome and on nostalgia for that which is fading away. In various strata of society there are, as before, many people who do not know how to live under conditions of openness and do not want to, people who would like to bridle the press as well. These are people who under the guise of criticizing the errors of journalists try to refute glasnost and to place themselves outside of criticism. Not all of our cadres have developed the proper political culture. The seeds of glasnost sometimes fall on the untilled soil of undeveloped democratic consciousness, devalued sense of human dignity, or sometimes simply fear.

All these are objective means and complexities for the formulation of glasnost. Yet, first of all, it would be incorrect, while acknowledging these phenomenon, to give those very same means of mass information any indulgence in criticism, even on the part of the opponents of glasnost. No, glasnost is for everyone. Democracy is for everyone. The prohibition against any "zones not subject to criticism" is also for everyone.

Secondly, glasnost in our country will be that much stronger and more effective the sooner it becomes the property not only of the press organs. Everyone can and must practice openness. It must become an integral part of the life of every labor collective and every party organization. If life is organized and proceeds according to the laws and morals of socialist society, then we have nothing to hide either from each other or from the outside world.

However, in all fairness we must also mention something else. Glasnost, to which we have come as an inevitable imperative of our life and of perestroika, is not only an enlightening category, but also a moral one. It is incompatible with pretensions toward a monopoly of views, with the imposition of one set of dogmas for another which we reject, with the serving of group interests, and especially with the distortion of facts and the drawing of personal accounts. When they print or broadcast only what the journalists or editors like, this is anti-glasnost. This is the worst manifestation of authoritarianism.

We are speaking of the press becoming the true expressor of social consciousness, or as K. Marx said, "a frank confession of the people to themselves," "a spiritual mirror in which the people see themselves." This presupposes its openness, the creation of conditions most favorable for expressing various points of view and for illuminating a broad spectrum of attitudes and problems in the means of mass information.

In general, the mandate of trust has been issued to the press. To justify it and to facilitate the passage of our society through the present day extremely complex and crucial stage of perestroika—that is also one of the multitude of upcoming specific tasks toward which the party conference and the July Central Committee Plenum are oriented.

The decisive moment has come when the strategy, principles, ideas and the party and state decisions based on them must be brought to life. This must be done in the provision of food, housing and social programs, as well as in cases where the economy is beginning to turn toward the end results, toward the consumer, toward the social sphere and scientific-technical progress. And, it must also be done where the foundations for our future are being laid—in economic and political reform.

It is specific deeds in all of these directions that will determine the fate of perestroika, and this means also our common fate. All of them are important. Each will leave an invisible but tangible trace for the future, for what our life will become and what we ourselves will become.

Very much will depend on the ability of the party and all its organizations to skillfully combine and coordinate goals and means. The specificity of the endeavor, the desire for the fastest possible result, and the force of habit will push us toward the traditional intensive approaches. We must understand: even if this gives some external effect, it will most probably turn out to be insignificant, short-lived and weak. And in the long-term perspective it will work against perestroika, against the endeavors and renovations. It will give the impression that things are new in word, but old in deed.

Let us not give in to such temptations. We will achieve our set goals only through new approaches. Socialism will live and develop, and it is our responsibility to act as prudent and mature masters, with a thought to tomorrow and to far-off days to come.

How should I close?

I should like to close with an appeal to principle in all our deeds. We must know how to recognize the common behind the specific, and not lose sight of man behind the common. We must scrupulously gather, interpret and select all that is new, all that serves socialism, and all that needs to be supported by word and deed, all that requires warmth, light and care, like any newborn thing.

I wish you success, comrades.

A discussion followed. Comrade A. N. Yakovlev answered questions posed by conference participants. (The discussions and answers to questions will be published in the next issue).

12322

Yakovlev Answers Questions From LiSSR Aktiv Participants

18000653a Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian
17 Aug 88 p 3

[Unattributed article: "In the Interests of the Country and Each People; Answers by A. N. Yakovlev to Questions Posed by Participants of the Republic Party-Ideological Aktiv"]

[Text] [Question] The combination of the duties of the first secretaries, including also the Secretary General, with the Soviet presidium chairmen—doesn't this mean a consolidation of power in the same hands and a belittling of the role and independence of the Soviets? Won't this be even worse than it is now?

[A. N. Yakovlev] This question continues to be valid. First of all, it is not presidiums, but simply the Soviets. This is the principle difference, if this is not clear to everyone. Let us take, for example, the rayon level, or even better the oblast level. The presidium has no right to issue any directives to the ispolkom. Only the Soviet, i.e., the session of the Soviet, can do this.

Won't this be even worse than it is now? I would proceed from the other direction: in general, can it be worse? Comrades, there is some misunderstanding in our comprehension of the matter. Here is a combination, but a combination with what? After all, there is yet no such duty as Soviet chairman. It is being introduced for the purpose of presiding in parliament. And so we propose, as a rule, to elect the first secretaries. Why? If we leave the first secretary not as the elected chairman of the Soviet, he will still not give up his power. The only method, possibly a transitional one, which will clearly delineate the functions between the state apparatus and the party apparatus, is to create strong, active ispolkoms which are not a part of the legislative organs. And it is not the raykom which should be placed over the ispolkom, for today the raykom secretary is a member of the ispolkom. Rather, he should be taken out of the ispolkom so that he will not bear responsibility for executive decisions, and made the chairman of parliament, which must be the supreme authority in this region.

If we add to this the reorganization of the party apparatus, we will be faced with the situation where we will be forced from now on to discuss many questions of economic, political, state and social life not in the raykom, but in the Soviet. Why must it be in the Soviet? Because

this is democratic and will occur in the name of the people, through their elected officials, who will be represented in the Soviet, in parliament, etc. This is the crux of the entire matter. What kind of combination is there, and with what? This is not a combination, because one thing simply was never present. We usually speak of the Soviet, but what we really mean is the ispolkom. We have become accustomed to this. We have an ispolkom, but we have never had a Soviet. Well, so what was the importance of your session and all our sessions? Why, none at all. But the ispolkom, that is another matter! So they did not go to the Soviet, but they went to the ispolkom, to its departments. And another absurdity was that the department heads were the deputies of the raysovet and oblsosvet. It is both the executor and the legislator. What does it cost simply not to fulfill something. It writes the laws for itself. We say that aside from the chairman alone, no one else there should have legislative power.

[Question] Isn't the discussion of Comrade Gorbachev at the last Plenum regarding a single-mandate system of elections for Supreme Soviet deputies a departure from the principles set forth at the preceding party forums, including also the 19th Party Conference, where the question of multi-mandate elections at all levels was discussed. The lower echelons of Soviet workers will be the scapegoats of the so-called multi-mandate democracy. Why isn't the upper echelon not the master of its mighty word?

[A. N. Yakovlev] I believe that there is also much misunderstanding on this question. After all, what is the crux of the matter? Elections are being held for town Soviets. We are speaking here of a multi-mandate system. Why? For example, we have to elect 7 deputies, and 12 have been nominated. All 12 are known in the village. So, let them elect 7 out of the 12. Seven have been elected, and 5 are left. Three of them received more than 50 percent of the votes, but less than those who were elected. They become assistant deputies. In order to avoid having to hold new elections in the case of various misunderstandings, as for example retirement or death, or some other reason, the assistant simply becomes the deputy.

As for levels above the rayon, the principle there is different. The elections will be held by districts, with a single mandate but with several candidates, so that each okrug will elect specific people from that okrug. For example, there are 7 okrugs and 7 deputies must be elected to the Soviet. Let the battle between several candidates for deputy be waged there, in the okrug. That is the crux of the entire matter.

[Question] How can we understand the press "corps" at the present time? Are they journalists, or are they the

opposition? Are they the opposition party, are they the journalistic party, or are they the ruling party?

[A. N. Yakovlev] If you are referring to the journalists of Lithuania, you can figure it out for yourselves whether they are the opposition party or the ruling party. If they are the ruling party, then all of you sitting here must put in for retirement, since a new ruling party has emerged. If they are the opposition, then you must determine the questions on which they oppose you. Maybe they can suggest some prudent proposals. I don't want to defend the journalists. As in any society, there is an equal percentage of smart ones and those who are not so smart. In every collective this percentage is the same from top to bottom. This is probably the case also for journalists. I have already told the journalists in Latvia: you have taken on such strong wings during perestroika and have gotten the idea that there is, as you say, my opinion, and there is the incorrect opinion. I spoke about this in Moscow, and even wrote about it. Journalists have this tendency. However, this is not something that has just appeared today, comrades! I myself worked in a newspaper office and remember the psychology there—the belief that we can do anything, and that we know everything. We should not strike a pose before them, and they should not strike a pose before us. Get down to the heart of each specific matter, and don't store up resentment. Resentment is resentment, and it does not solve anything.

Comrades, I have tried to say in my speech that on the whole the press has performed extensive work in improving the health of society. We must recognize this. However, there are also some errors. I will speak out everywhere most categorically against untruth and lies, specific and actual. If you tell a lie—you will answer for it! Perhaps what the journalists demand is not all: give us a law regarding the press. I say, give you a law on the press and you will be dragged through the courts.

So, as far as the role which your journalists play is concerned, that you must determine for yourselves. I believe you will have both the strength and the wisdom to accomplish this. Believe me, for God's sake, journalists are not really such bad people. You can reason with them if you want to.

[Question] What percentage of truth in publications must be considered as the full truth? Many journalists, as in the period of stagnation, are still adhering to and protecting themselves with Stalin's 5-percent truth. Is this permitted?

[A. N. Yakovlev] I believe the journalist who writes an untruth has no right to work in the press. He has no right to call himself a journalist, not a political right, not a moral right, not any right.

[Question] How should we understand the significant reduction in the party apparatus from top to bottom?

Aren't there too many secretaries, beginning with the Central Committee and going down to the raykom?

[A. N. Yakovlev] I would approach this question as follows: there should be as many as are needed. As many as are expedient, that is how many will be elected. As for the secretaries, you yourselves will decide how many secretaries you need. If you need 10, you will elect 10. If you need 2, you will elect 2. That is the first thing. As for the reduction in the party apparatus, we are now preparing projects which concern the Central Committee. And, as for the structure further down the line, that we will leave for the republic and kray party organizations to resolve. Here you, the Central Committee, will determine both the structure and the make-up. Of course, we will establish definite guidelines in percentages, which are nevertheless subject to reduction. But as far as what departments, how many, what duties, etc., whether the secretaries will be department heads or not, that you can decide for yourselves. You will meet for the plenum, and you will decide. The conditions, after all, are different, so how can we give you all the same scheme—from the Baltic to the Urals and further to Vladivostok. The territories are different, the people are different, the conditions are different, the social situation is different, the level of education is different, etc. So, the party apparatus should be structured in accordance with this. Today I cannot say what the effect of this significant reduction will be. Who knows, it may be 50 percent or 30 percent. I believe that about a 50 percent reduction is needed. That is my personal opinion. I don't think that we will be cutting back the number of positions in the ideological departments of the Central Committee.

[Question] We would like to know whether you will give the Lithuanian press the opportunity to publish your speech in its entirety.

[A. N. Yakovlev] I personally will not present them with this opportunity. That is up to the Lithuanian press.

[Question] Despite the decisions which are being made regarding provision of quality goods, particularly building materials, the supply system is notably deteriorating, and without capital investments, increased production or purchases from abroad, it is doubtful whether these questions may be resolved quickly. Neither the cooperatives nor the contractors can do anything about this situation, since the supply is poor. What is the Politburo and the government thinking and doing to resolve these problems? They must be resolved quickly, or the trust of the people will be lost.

[A. N. Yakovlev] As far as purchases are concerned, I would ask that you not hold me to answering this question, because if I name a sum now and say that we will make the purchases, I will immediately raise the price on the world market, and we will stand to lose from this. In this case glasnost [openness] may spell monetary

loss for us, because we are dealing with a foreign market. That is the first thing. Secondly, when we speak of building materials, I always think that we are simply victims of this centralization, this ultra-strong centralization. Since ancient times people have lived in such a way that they created their own building materials as they were needed and according to their capacities. When as a result of the great centralization of the building industry, brickmaking plants and many other facilities disappeared, we were left without building materials.

I was born in a remote Yaroslavl village. We had a brickmaking plant with a "huge" staff consisting of one person. He was both the director and seller of all the goods, but under the control of the commune. After all, the land was communal. They allowed him to dig near the forest, where there was sand. He supplied three village soviets with bricks. It was enough, even though he worked alone. But then this operation was eliminated and, naturally, there were no more bricks. They began bringing them in from Yaroslavl, I believe, or from somewhere else. Of course, it was from the city, while the clay and sand were sent to the city!

At the last Plenum we agreed that we must do everything possible to transfer the building industry to the local sites. Everyone is capable of making bricks. Such capacities are present everywhere. Even in places where there are bogs, I believe, we can find another building material. It cannot be otherwise. For example, no matter how much we complain to the State Committee on Construction Affairs, no matter how we curse it—and this we do, comrades—I believe it is all futile.

In regard to capital investments—we will invest them. The 30th Five-Year Plan, whose concept we will discuss sometime in November at the Politburo, will seriously differ from all the rest, very seriously, and particularly from the standpoint of its orientation toward social goals. We have many questions in this regard. For example, there is the question of the city and the village. We have to do something with the new priorities. Even in the housing problem we have to do something, build the resources in some other way. Then there is public health. After all, we did somehow manage to find 6 billion. We paid them out, and seemingly things went better with construction. There is evidently an improvement here, but not a very noticeable one, because this sphere—public health—is very badly neglected. I believe that we will be able to find even more. There are also many problems with the schools.

And in general, comrades, today we are developing something akin to a law on municipal ownership. The name is conditional. It is a name that simply stems, as is the custom in the world, from urban ownership. It is so the Soviet will have money, since we are now delegating such responsibility to it and it will decide everything. The industry which is located in its city is directly

subordinate, and that which, let us suppose, is subordinate to the republic or union, must pay it for being in this city. That is when, with the transfer of this delegated authority, there will be a local transfer of responsibilities, and not only responsibilities, but also rights. I believe much will change, including also on the question which Comrade Kubilyus poses. If we once again follow the path, as proposed here, of allocating capital investments and so forth, then there will be a repetition of that which was before and was not justified. Maybe you did not notice, but I mentioned one thing in my speech: these capital investments must be changed in general. For example, I personally am against capital investments. I believe that if someone needs to build, let him go to the commercial bank, which must be opened, and let him take money with interest. Then he will take care of this money. First of all, he will not take it if he does not need it. But what is happening now? We say we have capital. The republic decided that it has to build, and makes its calculations. It calculates that it needs, let us say, 50 billion rubles of capital investments for this endeavor. Then it adds on another 20 percent or more just in case. That means more billions. Then it goes on, the discussion begins, then the trade, and then they ask: add on another billion. And what for, when there is only 50 percent provision of the material resources as it is? Well, we'll find the rest somehow, they insist. What, they say, can't we spare the money? As I have already said, the only place where we have no shortage is in money. There is as much money as you like. Here you are. The entire problem in our economy today is the fact that there is a lot of money. There is an imbalance between the monetary supply and the supply of goods. Here the monetary circulation is disrupted and the country's financial situation is very serious. The state debt is huge. I am referring to the domestic debt. All this is very serious. The socialist system is the only thing that saves us from financial ruin. We have to get out of this somehow. Sometimes we have to dip into the savings books for wages, and your leaders also have to do this. Yet they do not give out commodity goods at the same time as they issue wages. They have taken them out of the savings account, but they still don't have the commodity goods. That means this money once again presses on the market and undermines the market situation.

[Comment from audience] Aleksandr Nikolayevich, in our republic it is quite the opposite.

[A. N. Yakovlev] The opposite? That's good, that means you are good fellows. Tell us, then, how you do this.

[Question] The farm workers wish to significantly expand the production of means of small-scale mechanization, and to make it cheaper. This will have a positive effect on the introduction and development of the rental form of rural organization of labor.

[A. N. Yakovlev] I don't know about making it cheaper. But as far as expanding it, the question here is as follows, comrades. For the time being, the only correction in this

five-year plan—a major correction—is the removal of 600 million rubles from the plan for the Ministry of Tractor and Agricultural Machine Building, i.e., Comrade Yezhevskiy's ministry. Why? Because the kolkhozes have not purchased tractors and agricultural machinery from it for this sum. As soon as they changed over to cost accounting, they stopped buying. First of all, it was expensive, and secondly, it was not qualitative. Aside from all else, it will be necessary to retool a number of plants for small-scale technology. Recently the minister again turned to the government. Evidently, we will have to decide about another 700 million, because the cancelled orders of kolkhozes which have changed over to cost accounting are still coming in. How was it before? Let us take, for example, "Selkhoztekhnika". It receives 20 combines and distributes them. "Listen, comrade, here, take a combine!" "But I don't need a combine. And I don't have any money." "So, go to the bank." "But how will I pay it back?" "Don't worry, you can return it in the fall." They take the combine, they take the credit, and in the fall their debts are written off and carried over to the next year. And that's it. But now the money they are operating with is their own. Cost accounting is already beginning to introduce serious corrections into our economic policy. A very notable process is taking place.

[Question] At the present time, the cities are developing much faster than the farm in all aspects. In solving the problems of the Food Program, the CPSU Central Committee and the country's government must make specific decisions for developing the social sphere in rural areas and for ensuring guaranteed material-technical supply. What is being done?

[A. N. Yakovlev] I believe that the upcoming Party Central Committee Plenum on agrarian policy will be devoted to this question to a significant measure, if not entirely. First of all, we must find new economic relations on the farm itself. This was mentioned also at the last Plenum: rental relations, different relations, i.e., various forms of realization of public and socialist ownership. No one intends to disband the kolkhozes and sovkhozes. But wherever the farmers, the farm cooperatives, the agricultural firm, and the farm combine or some other combinations are recognized locally as being more expedient—to their health! And I believe that at the next Plenum there will be a definite correction in monetary supply and material resources made in favor of the farm, and, I believe, we will use the comments of several of the workers made at the party conference, who said that the cities will have to tighten their belts a bit in favor of the farm. Otherwise, comrades, we will not get out of such a crisis situation.

[Question] The movement for perestroika in the Lithuanian SSR is disturbed by the question of where the facilities vacated in the process of management reorganization have disappeared to. Social justice demands openness and confidence that the reserves will be directed straight to the social infrastructure.

[A. N. Yakovlev] The same question was asked at one of our recent Politburo meetings. The ministries have undergone 40 percent cutbacks, yet no one has returned a single building. The Politburo ordered the Committee on People's Control to find out what happened to these facilities and buildings. I believe that if you have this problem, the Committee on People's Control should look into where the vacated facilities are going.

[Voice from the audience] It will be done.

[A. N. Yakovlev] They have to be handed over to the social infrastructure. At one of the recent Politburo meetings, Mikhail Sergeyevich spoke in great detail about this and noted that in all the cities all the first stories must be handed over for use as stores, cafes, various types of workshops, libraries, etc. But not for offices.

[Question] Socialism is impossible without socialist humanism. However, it is not being felt by those in Lithuania who have been exiled in the process of mass repressions—from 200,000 to 250,000 citizens, and especially their children who were born in exile. Every seventh or eighth resident of Lithuania could not have been a criminal. And after 40 years of Soviet rule, these poor people certainly deserve to return to their homeland.

[A. N. Yakovlev] This question is a difficult one. Or rather, it is not the question which is difficult, but its content. I have occasion to deal with this question, comrades. I am a member of the Politburo Commission on Rehabilitation. You see the first results. We still have 60-70 more groups of matters of this type. In general, I am a historian by specialty. Today I have become familiar with cases, some of which have never been mentioned anywhere before. I found out for the first time that there were such cases. These are only the central ones. All local cases must be resolved by the committees on party control themselves. We have decided to hand over all local rehabilitation work to the local party organs, who must report to us—the commission. However, they must report only in those cases when rehabilitation has been denied. We have also taken the question of deportations under our control. I believe that the Central Committees of the republic communist parties must also take this matter under their control. Of course, comrades, this question must be resolved, and we should not put off doing so.

Yet the questions are very complex. Often we find ourselves at a crossroads between the moral-political and the legal. Take the case with Yagoda, for example. Of course, he does not deserve rehabilitation. He is a villain, etc. However, had he been sentenced according to a different article, everything would be all right. Yet he is in the Bukharin case. Why, just like Bukharin, he didn't have the slightest relationship to the Bukharin case, i.e., to that group which it incriminated. In a strictly juridical sense, we are forced to rehabilitate him in this case. I, for

example, do not want to vote for Yagoda's rehabilitation, but in a strictly juridical sense I am obligated to do so. So you see, we noted there that we did not review this question. However, we were a little clever about it. We reviewed it, and how—inside and out. We listened to jurists, and these, and those, and others. We leafed through the entire case, how and what. It is true, we did not approach taking on this case, but we did discuss the question of Beria ahead of time. Of course, there is no question of Beria's rehabilitation. He cannot be rehabilitated, because there are articles according to which his sentence is quite sufficient. However, there are also accusations on matters which he had nothing to do with. There he is a Japanese, English, or what other kind of spy? Yugoslavian? What can we do? On one hand, why should we deal with Beria? May he not rest. Yet if, comrades, we create a lawful state and swear and take oaths to the law, and primarily the entire law, then there can be no exceptions. You see how complex it is?

It is especially difficult that all of them confessed, told some fabrications that they had met with some spies. Let us say, Krstinskiy, for example. During the investigation he would not testify. The second time, he confessed. At the trial he also confessed, even giving details as to the city where he met with the agents, and what kind of agents they were. Of course, all this was nonsense, beaten out of him with sticks or with I don't know what. But there are other cases that are only one page long. That means it was an anonymous tip, then the decision of the three, and then the report: operative commissioner senior lieutenant so-and-so, the sentence has been carried out.

And here is another difficulty. This is mutual slander. After all, Tukhachevskiy at first was not even mentioned anywhere in the case. Then he was mentioned in passing by another military man, who said that he knew someone somewhere and, in general, as yet did not even accuse him of anything. And then, Tukhachevskiy ends up in the drag-net, and becomes one of the main defendants. Who needs Shakespeare?! It was easier for him to untangle the relations of King Lear and the others. Well, we will work and we must work. We must bring this matter to its end.

If after the 20th Congress Khrushchev had not become frightened under the pressure of one, another, a third... and then of course by his character he was not prepared for any democratic decisions at this stage, and he simply became frightened, not wanting to involve people in this case, and then—the recoil. So he decided that if he had supposedly settled the account with Stalin, the case was closed. But what about Stalin? The matter now does not revolve around Stalin. It is Stalinism which is more important to us, so to speak. Stalin is dead, but Stalinism lives.

I have exhausted the questions, but I would like to say a few more words. It was mentioned here that party workers must deal primarily with repentance. I believe

the fact that we have begun perestroika constitutes the repentance of the party. We are not saying that we want to cleanse ourselves of something. We are saying that—yes, the party is at fault. It is ready to assume the guilt. And we will not continue to hide, no matter how we are pushed to do so. We not say yes, that's enough, we have talked about it. No. Here is the crux of the entire matter. When we speak seriously about the past, when we expose it, when we try to find the roots, the sources—that is one thing. When there is pain, there is shame and conscience.

But on the other hand, I must say directly that when someone begins to dance around, clapping and smiling,—oh, I have searched something out—one somehow gets a bad feeling. And it is primarily the party workers who get this feeling. Of course, it is a shame—both Uzbekistan and Kazakhstan, and maybe something else will be added. I would not exclude that possibility. But, comrades, we are not keeping silent about this, and we will continue to talk about it. How could we do otherwise, what other way is there? Can we hope that suddenly we will all be stricken with conscience, so let's not talk about this? We must talk about it! Although it is quite understandable that among the youth, for example, and not only the intelligentsia, we are not increasing our authority in this case. That is because the average man will say: "Oh, look at you, why should we trust you? First you have '37, then Rashidov, then Churbanov." Yet on the other hand, do we think we can hide everything? Well, we could hold on for another 10 years or so. The army is big. Well, and then what? Or maybe we really should try an entirely different variant, the democratization of society? When all the people are included in the process of democratization and control. I can half-way agree that we cannot shout "atu-atu" to the party worker. Well, but when you are guilty, then let's write about you. The journalists and everyone else must maintain tact here at all times. Perhaps our comrades from the circles of intelligentsia will object. They are already objecting in Moscow.

Today we are arguing there over the film "Peculiar Zone." The film was ordered by the party city committee. It is about Tregubov, Sushkov, and about bribe-takers. But look at how it is made. They show criminals in prison. Here is a young man, with his head shaven, wearing the appropriate clothing. Here, they say, is a rapist. His name is not given. Here, they say, is a bribe taker. Also no name is given. And this man is a robber, this one—a murderer. Again no names. And this one is the first bribe taker, the first secretary of such-and-such party city committee. I say no, comrades, this will not do. I say to the cinematographers: pardon me, but the first rapist is the producer of Gorky Studio, and this murderer, let us say, I don't know—the author of such-and-such a play.

Then, if you please, there is the party worker. But why is it so? The rank and file—why must we say only about the party worker that he is a bribe taker. Yes, he is a bribe taker. Who put him in jail? The law put him there. We

did not object. We were in favor of putting him away. We do not need such speculative selectivity. Let us conduct a sociological study of what percentage of bribe takers there are in the party, and how many there are in trade, how many in the militia, and how many in the VUZes? I believe the party will not rank among the first.

One of you here said quite correctly that the Lithuanian people have nothing to be ashamed of in their history, just as any other people. Here is why I want to mention this and focus attention upon it. After all, look at what happens here in Moscow sometimes. You write about '37, you say, you undress politically. Why do you need to do this? This, after all, strikes a blow to the prestige of the country and the people. But why the people? What kind of a ploy is this when a bankrupted political leader says that it was not he, but the entire people along with him. What did he applaud? What else is he guilty of? No, this concept must be entirely rejected and cast aside. That some leader must be the fault of the entire people, and therefore they should be ashamed of their history? Why should they be ashamed of it? It is the same history as it has always been. Let us take feudal England. It hung people on the walls of the Tower and placed human heads on stakes for a long time, until they shriveled up. It is not ashamed of this history now, its own history. That is the way things were, and it is not something to be ashamed of.

In general, however, history is impartial to you and me. In general, history is indifferent to us. We should not be so vain, so self-conceited that we can condemn history or be ashamed of it. History will get along without us, and will give its own evaluations. I believe that whatever the history of a people may be, from whatever period, whatever happened in it, we should not be ashamed of this history. No people should be ashamed of their history. No matter how difficult and at times tragic it may have been. Therefore I most seriously share the opinion expressed here by my comrade, and believe that ultimately everything must be published and said. I don't think that you and I are such eccentrics that we cannot explain something to the people, sometimes even that which is difficult to explain. And, we must acknowledge that which is difficult to explain.

I think constantly, I think in torment, about what the reason was for Stalinism. I say to myself: it was that, and that, and that. And then I stop myself. No, I don't know what it was. Although formally there is a philosophical set of answers, and a political-economic and a political set. But when you ask yourself seriously, you begin to doubt. No, that is something which is on the other side of good and evil. And that means it is not rationally explainable. However, we are obliged to seek the truth. History will give us the answer anyway. If not now, then after we are gone.

One comrade said here that they do not write the truth in newspapers, and this includes what they write about party workers. I would only suggest one thing. We must write to these newspapers ourselves. We must argue and substantiate. That is the only way.

Here one comrade presented a speech, spoke about structure, and asked about instructions on elections. They will be available in the near future. For the primary party organizations—take it as a friendly wish, and you will not be wrong. First, hold the elections democratically. Secondly, do it in a business-like manner, so that there will be criticism, so that conclusions may be drawn and shortcomings recognized. And thirdly, elect your leaders freely, as you yourselves want. If you implement these three principles, you will not need instructions until the year 2000.

And finally, one last thing. Thank you for your evaluations. I should probably argue about them, but I would like to say something else. Trust for trust. Don't be quickly disillusioned. Why do I say this? I can promise that we will not leave the path upon which we have embarked, no! This is because we cannot live any other way. We simply cannot. However, I think we will have some serious difficulties. Politics is never a straight line along which there are no breaks, no errors. We have them even now, and we are already talking about them. For example, we have made a mistake with the state order. Did we tell about it? Yes, we did. And furthermore, comrades, let us speak about the mistakes we have made. For example, with the cooperatives. We made the decision about a progressive tax. Then we assumed the position: oh, we have made the decision—and that's all! Now they have stopped enforcement of this law, and returned to the old one—to 13 percent. And now scientists and specialists are studying the question of what kind of tax there should be, and when it should be introduced. Just don't put all the blame on us and say: "Oh, how many mistakes you have made!" Who of us has not made mistakes in life? This is all according to the famous biblical quotation, in the words of Jesus Christ: let him cast the first stone...

There are probably tests awaiting us, especially in the upcoming years. In the primary elections, there will evidently be a serious change in the secretariats of the party organizations as a result of the elections. They will have to assimilate new methods. Will the best people be elected, and will they indeed be the best? Evidently, the course of life is such. Although, possibly, there will also be mistakes. The new will not necessarily be revolutionary or in the spirit of perestroika. It may be quite the opposite. There are probably difficulties awaiting us also at the elections to the Congress of People's Deputies, as well as difficulties with the election law. We will adopt and discuss the laws on the so-called informal associations, and on volunteer citizen associations. We will probably also have a lengthy discussion of the law regarding the press. And so, this will probably be in arguments and discussions, particularly since today the situation is entirely different.

Maybe someone thinks that here, in the lower echelons, they argue, but we in the Politburo supposedly do not have any differences of opinion? We do, but everything is discussed under normal conditions. After all, if we are

following the path of perestroyka, let us share the responsibility. Of course, you will say, what a clever fellow. They do it, and we must answer for it. No. We must reject this psychology. We must achieve the situation whereby everyone will be responsible for the implementation of democracy. Not everyone is ready for this, including myself. Our thinking is not ready for it.

Sometimes they say that we are moving toward Western democracy. Comrades, it is nothing of the sort. I have lived 11 years abroad. I studied one year at the university, and worked for 10. When I saw the Canadian parliament in session on television, I thought at first: how amazing. Look at how one party fights with the other. They criticize each other. Then I looked closer and closer: it was a spectacle. And at the end I left with the impression that it was a repulsive spectacle. Here is a member of parliament pounding away at the minister of the ruling party, practically with the last words. You think: "Well, that's it." If it were that way with you and me, I would die before I reached out my hand to you. But there? On television you see: one pounds away at the other, the other defends himself. Then the speaker calls a recess. One goes up to the other, ha-ha-ha, they embrace and go to lunch. Maybe someone will say that this is political culture. No, comrades, it is not always so.

There are also some positive aspects there. I see them, for example, in the fact that the minister is nevertheless under control. If there is something beneficial, it is control. However, it doesn't stop them from creating lawlessness.

We have to create our own democracy, our own approaches. They must be more honest, more responsible, and more wise. And here we must proceed all together. In our arguments we hear: the press, the intelligentsia, informal association. So we think up horrors. First we ourselves invent a demon, and then we fear him. There he is now, flying over the sinful Earth. We begin to catch him. This is a transitional period, comrades, a transitional period. We will get used to it. Otherwise, what kind of a party would we be? Comrades, think about this. It is like a political avant-garde. We are moving toward an understanding of a political avant-garde. And in reality, there must be a political avant-garde. However, it must have entirely different functions, and entirely different approaches to everything. Are we not ready yet? No, we are not ready. But in 1985 we were not ready for the present day. Yet it came, and we live, sit in meetings, talk, and make plans for the future. That is how it will be later. We are not ready for that which will occur in the middle of next year after the creation of a new power—a truly Soviet power, in the country. Today we are not ready. But it will come. We must believe in what we have begun, and we must move ahead.

Thank you and best wishes!

12322

**Speeches by Participants in LSSR Party
Ideological Aktiv**

18000653b Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian
17 Aug 88 pp 1-2

[Text of speeches presented at the Republic Party-Ideological Aktiv: "In the Interests of the Country and Each People"]

[Text]

**Speech by K. V. ZALETSKASA, first secretary of the
Vilnius Party Gorkom.**

Although more than a month has passed since the conclusion of the 19th All-Union Party Conference, the interest of Vilnius residents in its results is not waning. The capital's workers are returning again and again to the problems which were raised at the party forum and specifying them from the standpoint of the everyday concerns of their collectives and their personal interests. The discussions, as a rule, are frank, principled, and at times even sharp. We may conclude that in the course of this process there are often new proposals presented for improving economic management and intensifying the process of democratization. Yet at the same time perestroyka [reorganization] in our party organization is still proceeding slowly, as CPSU Central Committee Secretary Aleksandr Nikolayevich Yakovlev rightly noted today in his speech. It is specifically for this reason that there is intolerance on the part of individual groups of the city population, an uncompromising nature of their demands, and a categorical quality of their judgments.

Today I would like to focus your attention on problems which are of greatest concern to the party gorkom, the party active membership, and all the communists and workers of the city. The recently held gorkom bureau meeting once again examined vital problems. Specifically, all party gorkom departments and gorispolkom services have been told to work out [these problems] in close contact with the specialists of enterprises and organizations, scientists from the Lithuanian SSR Academy of Sciences, ministries and departments. First of all this concerns questions associated with assimilating economic methods of management, rejecting the administrative-bureaucratic style of enterprise management, and overcoming departmentalism.

Considering the acute nature of the questions raised by society, questions which are associated with the improvement of the ecology, an integrated urban program is being developed for the creation of waste-free production. It will be based on interesting proposals of specialists at the scientific-production association "Litstankoprojekt" and other scientific collectives. However, the republic and union organs must take immediate measures to improve the ecological conditions in our region, to introduce new technologies at enterprises

which are already in operation, and to change over the TETs-3 [Heat and Power Plant 3] to gas fuel, since this facility is one of the city's main polluters.

We are concerned about the state of affairs with restoration and regeneration of the Old City. It is encouraging to see that recently attention of the Lithuanian CP Central Committee and the republic government has significantly increased toward this sore point in our lives. However, we are seeking means of speeding up this work and of more closely involving the collectives of the city's enterprises and organizations in it, since we have not yet been able to do this.

Considering the numerous proposals received from city residents and the concern which they show in connection with the realization of the program for providing every family with housing before the year 2000, we have once again analyzed the measures outlined by the building organization labor collectives. After all, in Vilnius there are 38,000 families on the waiting list for housing.

People judge the results of perestroika largely by the degree of satisfaction of their own spiritual and material needs. We still have cases of shortages, long waiting lines, and interruptions in the sale of basic priority goods. We have had to re-introduce the use of tickets for a number of goods. There are many reasons for this, both of an objective as well as of a subjective order. Some things we can already resolve in the near future. Thus, for example, in the city the provision of trade area comprises 75 percent of the norm. Today there is an on-going reduction in the management apparatus. This means that some space must be vacated. We believe it is possible to hand over this space, especially the first stories of buildings, for stores and consumer service enterprises. Appropriate proposals to this effect have been prepared by the gorispolkom. I would like to call upon the managers of departments in the republic and in the rayons adjoining Vilnius to open more of their company stores in the capital.

The intensification of democratic processes and glasnost have increased the political and social activity of Vilnius residents. Not all party organizations have turned out to be ready to assume democratism in their relations not only in word, but also in deed. Two extremes have emerged. One is the adherents of the old "don't let them" approach, and the other is those who turn democratization into all-permissiveness, the desire to negate everything that had been done during the years of Soviet rule. We believe that both of these positions contradict the spirit of perestroika. Many different neoformal associations have appeared in the city in recent months. We try to establish contact with each of them and to render party influence.

Let me say a few words about the Movement for Perestroika in Lithuania. Its initiative group has presented its platform. The basic goals of the movement correspond to the spirit of the 19th Party Conference. They

are also understood in the party gorkom and in the labor collectives, where 35 support groups have already been formed. However, we cannot help but see that various extremists, anti-Soviet and nationalistic elements are trying to associate themselves with the movement. During the movement's organization of measures, we often see and hear their provocational, nationalistic slogans and attributes, and encounter the unwillingness to listen to the counter-argued presentations of the party and Soviet aktiv.

Therefore, we believe that communists who are part of the initiative group must be more active in exerting their ideological influence on politically immature persons who desire to join the movement.

At the present time we must act much more decisively. We must review the approaches to the ideological-class, international, and patriotic education of the population. At first glance it might seem that for us, Vilnius residents, everything must be objectively clear in solving these problems. In May of this year the work of the city party organization in this direction was reviewed at the Lithuanian CP Central Committee Plenum. The tasks stemming from its decisions were discussed at the plenums of the party gorkom and raykoms, and the primary party organizations. A set of measures was developed and is being implemented. Nevertheless, there are many difficulties in inter-ethnic relations. They are explained primarily by the problems which have accumulated in past years, by the desire of the masses to resolve them as quickly as possible, and finally, by the activation of hostile forces beyond our borders. They take the events of 1939-1940 in Lithuania as the basis for their propagandist activity, as well as individual incidents in USSR foreign and domestic policy. Today we must self-critically acknowledge the fact that the party and ideological aktiv cannot specifically, on the basis of documents, give an exhaustive rebuff to these actions. We do not have them [these documents] at our disposal, and thereby are creating a basis for demagogic discussions and for inciting nationalistic sentiments among the people. We hope that our scientists, and primarily our social scientists, will shortly introduce some clarification into the illumination of the historical past from the above-mentioned period in our country and republic. However, this must be done on the basis of historical documents and with full responsibility. We believe that under the current situation and in the presence of different evaluations, the departments and the Secretariat of the Lithuanian CP Central Committee must take a more active position.

During the years of stagnation, many unsolved problems, unwarranted resentments, and manifestations of social injustice have accumulated. Many people do not have a clear understanding of the reasons for the contradictions in development of our society, or of the means for eliminating them. Yet there is a great desire to bring about order as quickly as possible. Therefore, along with well-founded and specific criticism, we may hear sharp judgements evoked by lack of information or emotions.

However, we must clearly delineate those who are in error from those who maliciously force the confrontation of various national groups. Vilnius has for centuries been a multi-national city, and remains such.

In our everyday life we encounter individual manifestations of nationalism and chauvenism. Specifically, the object of attack is the national symbolics and the recognition of Lithuanian as the state language. In our opinion, the resolution of these questions has dragged on too long. The continuation of the discussion on these problems gives rise to unhealthy emotions and inflicts serious harm on the formation of feelings of internationalism and Soviet patriotism. The republic's Supreme Soviet Presidium must promptly examine this question.

Life dictates to us the necessity of truly mastering the political methods of leadership, as required also by the decisions of the 19th Party Conference. We clearly understand that all of us, the party workers and the aktiv, must be closer to the people. We must know and see the problems which demand immediate solution. We must be sensitive and responsive. We must defend and explain the political line of the party.

Speech by V. I. DOMARKAS, Rector of Kaunas Polytechnical Institute imeni A. Sniechkus

The scientific-pedagogical VUZ associates bear a dual responsibility—the responsibility for direct participation in scientific-technical progress and the spiritual development of society, and the responsibility for the quality of training of the future specialists. We may cite numerous examples to confirm that most VUZ workers in our republic, including in our institute, are in step with perestroika. They are organizing their work in accordance with the documents on reorganization of higher and secondary special education. The VUZes can state with satisfaction that in the past 3 years there has been a significant change in the political and spiritual face of our society. Yet at the same time we must note that the changes in material provision have been insignificant. This brings us to the thought: perhaps we have gotten too carried away with criticism and formulation of tasks and discussions, and not placed enough emphasis on the fact that the basis of all progress is honest, creative labor.

This is specifically why in recent years, at the initiative of the party committee and the rectorate, we are trying to more objectively evaluate the institute associates according to specific results, and to develop the independence of students in study and in their creative endeavors. Here we must state that the scientific and methodological production of different associates is quite different. The leaders in science and pedagogy hold new forms of integration of science and production on their shoulders. With their help, the institute has become one of the leaders in the country in scientific work, including also

in the scientific work of students. However, there is also much ballast, and it is difficult to get rid of. Often democracy helps demagogues too. Everyone must learn democracy.

The drop in prestige of honest labor is disturbing not only because some VUZ associates do not work in full measure. This is a problem of our entire society. Love of work and knowledge must be developed from childhood. On the other hand, it is very important that the mechanisms of economic reform which ensure the labor wage be put into operation as soon as possible.

The negative tendencies in the decline of society's respect for serious labor are evident also in the formulation of the contingent of VUZ students. In recent years there has been no competition for machine building, power engineering, and other engineering specialties which are very important to the national economy. Of course, other reasons also play a role here. (One of them is the feminization of secondary school graduates. In our republic, due to the unbalanced appointment to vocational-technical schools, there are two times more girls among school leavers than there are boys.

On the whole, the students of the technical VUZ have a rather serious outlook on life. However, slogans are no longer enough for the ideological upbringing of today's generation of students. Students want to know the historical truth. They are interested in knowing what guarantees there are of the fact that the former gross political, economic, and ecological errors are not repeated. The students believe in perestroika, and they react very sharply to any deviations from the proclaimed principles of perestroika.

In conclusion, let me say a few words about the problems of economic independence and ecology which have been widely discussed in the republic. At the suggestion of our institute the question of VUZ scientists helping party and Soviet organs as consultants in preparing documents concerning, for example, the development of industry, etc., has been included in the plan of work for the republic's Council of VUZ Rectors. I hope that the VUZes will not turn down such work when it meets with their profile. Among other scientific-technical problems, our institute will give much attention in the future to the question of ecology. This year the department of industrial ecology has been introduced, and students are being accepted for the specialty of "environmental protection and rational application of natural resources." As for the construction of major new industrial facilities or the expansion of existing ones, the residents of the republic have the right to demand that the government conduct an ecological investigation with participation of the republic's scientists before making a decision. If the union ministries pay no attention to objective comments—this must be viewed as a violation of the resolutions of the 19th Party Conference. On the other hand,

the republic government is primarily responsible to the republic's residents for its decisions, and if the people approve its activity, the union institutions should also have full trust in it.

Speech by YA. V. MINKYAVICHYUS, Chairman of the Philosophy Department, Lithuanian SSR Academy of Sciences

For many decades we have listened to speeches of various genres—both triumphal-crushing and sorrowful-pleading. Today we have moved on to the expose-confessional. They were, of course, eclectically mixed—changing situations and different conditions always brought something different to the forefront. And now the turn of the latter genre has come. The genre is necessary, but it seems to me, entirely inadequate. We have already partially stated that it must be imbued with political culture. We all need this, and especially under those conditions when a mass movement is finally approaching, and it is already here. We need it when rationality and irrationality become intertwined. I do not relate emotions to this, because it would be incorrect to contrapose one to the other. If perestroika is revolutionary, then how can we do without feelings? People always entered a revolution with lofty feelings. I believe that today many people have them. This is not the place to talk about what constitutes political culture. There will be appropriate seminars, conferences, and treatises. There is also the press and books. Let us work in this sphere, which deserves extremely great attention.

Yesterday at the Academy of Sciences they spoke about repentance and conscience. Of course, scientists also need this, but it is not those who needed it, as they need it today, that were the ones who made science. And it is not those who are in a hurry to repent that make science. It was made and will continue to be made by those who live by this, who have an internal need to be just this way. This is no less true also of party workers.

I believe that party workers also need repentance and conscience. We all know this already. We know much, but there is even more that we do not know. That is the nature of dialectics. If out of 14 of the first leaders of the republic party organizations 4 turned out to be the way they were, then what does this mean for our party? Where is the cleansing needed? Where is the conscience? We must start first of all here.

We need to continue breaking down myths. We have begun to overcome the myths. I can name many myths which we have created. There are three theses. One of them concerns us and our party, the scientific organization of labor, and scientific management. Yet the leadership is wise. In general it was above any scientific ideas. Therefore, we need an integration of conscience and scientific nature. The current system of training party cadres and the current party schools do not correspond to the very high requirements. Another thesis is—what does the party mean? The party is implementing

perestroika, and has embarked upon it. We know very well who started this and who is doing this, and where the achievements are. We know that this is being done by comrades Gorbachev, Shevardnadze, and Yakovlev. We are grateful to you for coming to Latvia and Lithuania. I am saying this to you out of old sympathies. I had the honor of being in the party organization, where I served as secretary. I apologize for the public recognition.

The next myth is our ideology, from which we demanded omnipotence. If the economy cannot—ideology must do it. If politics is not doing it, if law is not doing it—then ideology must do everything. This myth continues to live, and is the so-called education myth. It is necessary to teach everything: an atheistic society, an internationalist society, everything else must be instilled without considering the realities. Reality is not pliant, but the educators must make it so. Moreover, instructors who are not too well brought up take on this educational approach. And here is another myth. It is the myth of scientific-technical progress. How many triumphs have we had in this progress! Yet we have not considered the most elementary factor—dialectics. We have not considered the fact that there is no progress without internal contradictions which give negative consequences. We wrote these consequences off as the myth—there they have negative phenomena, but under socialism we do not.

Thus, turning our current expose-confessional genre to our own conscience, I believe there is no such buró, no such press and no such church where your sins would be forgiven or where you can find their justification. Only our internal need, our own catharsis—nothing else can cleanse us.

Yesterday in the Academy of Sciences they spoke about the priorities of scientific research, about the search for such objects, such spheres and problems which must lead our science to new horizons, considering, of course, the internal contradictions. I would like to go farther, deeper, and broader on this topic. We must define the priorities of our existence and concentrate competent scientific attention in all instances, depending on one's competency. These must be the priorities of existence at the human level! How much we have said about the human factor, today—already as the decisive one. Yet when was it not decisive? And when will it not be decisive? It will be decisive as long as we exist. There is no other factor but the human one. Thus: the priority of existence is at the human level, at the national level, at the state level, the natural level, etc. We have here such a rich palette of these priorities. They require the specific competence of scientific research so that the scientific word will become deed.

And furthermore, the dialectics of the national and the international was presented so beautifully here. I would say, with intellectual elegance. However, there is the syndrome of nationalism. Some comrades suffer from

this syndrome, seeing nationalists everywhere. If nationalism is ours, we must deal with it. Whether it is to be or not depends on us. When I said this 46 years ago, the tribunal was a bit lower. Already then they called me a nationalist. We have to help them break with nationalism, they said. After all, you are well acquainted with our incompetent helpers who say: "Oh, they have nationalists there. Oh, they have Catholicism there, we have to help them." So they help, but how much folly is there in this help?

How often have we heard that the communists must go to the masses? Yet as soon as the masses came out in favor of perestroika, some communists ...took to the hills. After all, not all communists meet the masses half-way.

I must also mention the Komsomol and the youth. Honorable comrades, you are not only members of the government. You are also fathers, maybe grandfathers and uncles. So, enough of speaking in the language of didactics with the Komsomol. A House of Political Enlightenment is being built next door. Build it and give it to the Komsomol. Do not let old scholastics and dogmatism enter the new house. Let the youth inspire this house. If perestroika is revolutionary, then the revolution can be created only by those who have the spirit for it.

I asked one philosopher: "Is it possible to perform a revolutionary reorganization if the spirit is impoverished and a little cowardly?" He said: "Yes—but only out of fear."

**Speech by P. A. BRAZHENAS, first secretary of the
LISSR Writer's Union governing board**

We are living in a time of deep pondering and high flight of thought. Every day there are fewer and fewer people who can believe that this is not another ordinary campaign, but the norm for the present and future life. Every day there are more and more people—although this process could be even more dynamic—who understand that the essence of democracy and socialism is not exhausted by the capacity to think freely and to express one's thoughts, that democracy and socialism are the right and the responsibility to work, to turn word into deed, and ideas into material force.

Today, when by the resolutions of the 19th All-Union Conference the party has expressed its desire to reject the duplication of managerial and administrative functions which has quite firmly entangled it, and to invest all its organizational and intellectual potential, all its revolutionary experience, in the sphere of political strategy; when Lenin's slogan "All power to the Soviets!" has again resounded, and when the labor collectives are beginning the difficult but legalized struggle for the right to be masters of their own enterprise or farm, and thus also masters of their own country, for each and every one

it is very important to determine the correct, goal-oriented and perspective program of one's actions, to take up that which one knows the best, where one can work most effectively and achieve the highest results.

I believe it would not be immodest to say that the writers of the republic were among the first to sense with their keen ear and to support with their impulsive temperament the program of perestroika begun by the CPSU Central Committee. It is no accident that writers and other creative workers and scientists have placed themselves in the front ranks of the broad social movement which we today call the Lithuanian movement for perestroika.

The attitude toward this movement is non-synonymous. Hundreds of thousands support and trust it. Some do not understand it, while others are afraid of it.

I am not authorized to speak in the name of the movement for perestroika, but since I feel myself to be a member of its ranks, I will dare to express a thought or two.

I understand the movement primarily as an expression of the public support for the strategic course toward perestroika announced by the party, but not only that. In the movement, as well as in other informal associations, there is a sense of concern for the fate of perestroika. This is also a unique challenge to the cautious approach by official institutes, their sluggishness, indecisiveness, and relapses of the old style of thinking.

Pardon me for the shocking image, but for clarity I will say: there would surely be no informal movements if every republic, kray, oblast or rayon, every labor collective and primary party organization had its own Gorbachev, even a mini- or micro-Gorbachev—an active, brave, decisive leader of perestroika. However, raising the cadres for decades according to the principle of personal servility, where can we now find so many brave and independent people who are not afraid of responsibility?!

The movement for perestroika, aside from all else, allows a person to show himself. There are many communists in this movement. Others, without a doubt, will come into the party. And, I hope, we will also learn to work with the non-party members, just as Lenin taught us. However, the work should not be put off. And we should not be afraid if shells or silt cling to the hull of the ship which has raised its sails. Whatever dirt has collected on the ship of our ruling and leading party over the decades, this ship will pass over the shoals of history, over the coarse gravel of perestroika. It will be cleansed and sail away.

But the ship of the movement is a new one. We must trust it and not hold it at the roadstead for too long. We must not create an ambiguous situation: sometimes we agree with it, sometimes we doubt it, sometimes we

conduct a discussion, sometimes we insinuate something. The movement needs legal status and at least an elementary base of activity. On the other hand, it also needs a clear, and at such a decisive historical moment, also a precise program. We need mutual tact, trust, and of course, specific tasks which can be fulfilled. Much is still needed. One way or another, we must admit that we are still at the first stage of getting to know democracy.

I hope that sooner or later we will rise to a higher level in this sphere. I return to the problems by which the Union of Writers, its leadership and its party organization live. The unnoticed creative process, which in recent years has given us tens of new books, does not stop for even a minute. Among these books are several good contemporary ones. I have no doubt that in the future there will be more. The talents which have been freed from petty worries and outdated stereotypes of thought will bear their fruit. Yet today we speak more of the writer at the sections of perestroika.

Recalling the old geographical image, I would say that our social activity generally rests on four supports: history and literary heritage, language and ecology. We believe that it is criminal to keep quiet or speak in half-tones about the history of a people, as if it were worse or more shameful than the history of other peoples. A state, a people who in the middle ages withstood the expansion of the crusaders from the West and the Golden Horde from the East, even though after that they experienced a "fatigue" along their historical path; in the 18th century wrapped in the smog of polonization, in the 19th century finding themselves in the czarist prison of peoples, and in the 20th century again taking heart, making their contribution to the victory of the socialist revolution and the struggle against fascism—such a people and state should not be ashamed of their history.

Even under unfavorable historical conditions, a significant legacy of national literature and art on the whole has been accumulated, and on our conscience—national and party—is the fact that a good portion of this heritage has not become the property of socialist culture. "Better late than never," we said at the Writers' Union Plenum, and I think we will keep our word in the near future.

The building material of literature is language. We possess one of the oldest Indoeuropean languages, which already for two centuries has been studied by Russian, German, Polish, Finnish, why bother naming them all—linguists of all Europe, and not only Europe. We possess a language whose internal resources are enough to convey the thought of Plato and Kant, Marx and Lenin, the images of Dante and Shakespeare, Goethe and Dostoyevskiy, Faulkner and Marques. It is a language which has helped us preserve ourselves as a people. It has earned great concern about its current state, and especially its future.

As for the matter of ecology... Today, when the entire huge country—from the Baltic to Sakhalin—is sounding the alarm regarding the ecological position, I would like to express one unexpectedly optimistic thought. A great leap has been made in ecology in the last 3 years. The air which we breathe has been significantly purified of the pollutants most dangerous to man—the unnecessary secrecy and lies, misinformation and demagoguery, boasting and self-glorification.

Not to evaluate all this means to give up our position, to lose faith in the prospects of our actions. To evaluate it means to feel the need for efforts, to strengthen the hope that the struggle for a clean Nyamunas and Baltic, for ecologically tamed giants of chemistry and for safe atomic power plants have a future.

I am touching upon questions and problems which seem to be nationally specific, suggested by national experience. Yet in our consciousness there is always the thought that it is not only in our multi-national state, but also on our entire planet that the problems whose roots will not penetrate to neighboring geographic territories are disappearing.

National questions in our multi-national state automatically become the common concern. And the longer we ignore them or do not want to solve them, the more difficult it will be later to pay off the increasing interest rates.

I do not like quotations, but I would like to present an example: "Only together can we solve our social problems, and only by means of revolutionary renovation." These are the words uttered several days ago by our honored guest. I sign my name under them believing that there is a harmony between them and what I have said. I can reinforce this harmony with one other thought, dictated by the epoch of perestroika.

Having become accustomed to thinking declaratively on a cosmic scale or on the scale of one-sixth of the Earth, we often forgot to sweep our own back yard, to weed our own garden and to hoe around the flowers in our own garden. If we had done this without waiting for collective help organized from above—how much cleaner, more satisfying and brighter things would suddenly become on this one-sixth of the globe.

Taking advantage of this opportunity for the first time in my life—to say several words directly to a member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, I would like to express one more conviction and request. In Lithuania there are quite a few forces which unquestioningly support the course of the 27th Party Congress and the 19th All-Union Party Conference. Let us not let anyone

distort them—not the central ministries and departments who have not rejected their monopolistic ambitions, not the planning agencies who have gotten bogged down in trifles, not the local initiators who occupy larger or smaller posts and whom the people ironically call “holier than the Pope.”

Through the language of party decisions and documents, such people and phenomena have already several times been given a principle and merciless evaluation. The time has come to evaluate them in the voices of the communists and the voters. The upcoming reporting-election meetings in the party organizations, and the formulation of new organs of Soviet power will accomplish this. I hope that in this decisive moment, as many of us as possible who have honestly consulted with our conscience will forget our warm comfortable chairs and will think more about the responsibilities of man and communist. Those who do not think about this will sooner or later be reminded by the people's party.

Speech by L. K. SHEPETIS, Lithuanian CP Central Committee secretary

We are living in a time of resurrection of true values. Therefore we ask much and think much.

We, the ideological workers, do not have the right to ignore the question of why the extensive and principle discussion held at the 19th All-Union Party Conference and the July Plenum of the Central Committee regarding the state of affairs in our party house, the style and methods of the party's implementation of its avant-garde role in perestroika, have not yet been properly perceived as applied to our own practice. Could it be that the immediate, practical conclusions are not being drawn?

The first secretaries of the party committees are in attendance here. Remember, recently we spoke about the fact that one of the reasons for this breakdown consists of the inability, and sometimes even the unwillingness to perform work by political methods, and of the complexity of mastering the entire arsenal of democracy and glasnost. Yet no other directive means is given.

Yes, it is a complex science—an ideological departure from dogmatism and stagnation, but it is the only true Leninist science. For 3 years now we have seen on Central Television, we have heard, and we have become convinced with our own eyes how we should learn this science, how we should speak with people in a new, humanitarian tone. This is what our conference today teaches us, as well as writers meetings and scientific study evenings.

Is there a more comprehensive answer to the question of why we sometimes become lost and do not regain our self-composure? This answer lies in the very time of revolutionary renewal. It is in that historical chance, in the real possibility of enhancing the positive and ridding ourselves of the accumulated negative. Yes, we want to

achieve very much in one swoop. Yes, we live in a socialist society and want more socialism and more that is real. Yes, we live in a single family of Soviet peoples and want our unity to be more sincere, humanely pure, when the international is achieved only through the national. Is this not why in social discussion we place in the forefront the problems which most significantly touch upon the fates of the individual as well as all nations, of a large or small homeland? What are these problems?

It is national culture, which also includes ecological culture. It is the continued development of principles of the socialist state. It is the economic independence of the republic. It is no secret to anyone—and this discussion is currently going on at our meetings—that every one of the above-mentioned intentions has its “stumbling-block.”

The definition of goals and methods of development of culture, science and education is truly independent.

It is the rejection of the irrational dictate of “departments” in the sphere of construction of industrial facilities, especially without projects. We should not build a third unit of the Ignalinskaya AES.

I already had occasion to speak at the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet regarding the legal evaluation, with the all the ensuing rehabilitational consequences of the deportation acts.

Does this mean that all such problems may be resolved by circumventing all-state interests, outside the unified complex of the country. In no way does it mean this. On the contrary, only by depending on the entire country can we resolve these questions. And we will never depart from the principles of unity!

We will build our ideological work based on the fact that democratization has literally shaken up the people. Today the political activity of all the strata is rather high, and evidently will continue to increase. It is by far not always possible to direct the growing political energy of the people to priority directions for perestroika, to sense and foresee the development of attitudes, to go forth not at the tail end of events, but to go ahead of them with effective and creative actions. This leads to a certain sense of loss by local managers of various rank (I would not maintain that all of them are poor managers). This leads also to certain “resentment” toward the press, toward the “unruly” youth, toward certain actions of the intelligentsia. This leads also in certain measure to our long drawn-out indeterminacy in regard to new social movements, the most colorful of which is the movement for perestroika (“Sayudis”).

“Sayudis” is the child of perestroika, and in a certain sense, also of our sluggishness in the affairs of perestroika. Therein lies the duality of our activity.

Of course, the CPSU has presented the idea of perestroika, and it is bringing it to life. The republic party organization, supported by the participation of the broadest strata of the population, has developed a platform which its delegation has taken to the 19th All-Union Party Conference, and which today for some reason is not sufficiently recalled. It is in tune with the names of the movement, the activity of the greatest make-up of its initiative group, and its publicized principles. In noting the positive role of the movement in formulating a number of important questions and in performing certain actions, it would be good to call upon the members of its initiative group to show greater responsibility for their words and deeds. Sometimes we make extreme generalizations or present unsubstantiated demands. Some of the members of the movement, especially among the youth, at times are lumped together with nationalists of the "league of freedom" type, who yearn for separatism. And this, as V. Martinkus, chairman of the republic's Union of Writers governing board, said yesterday at the meeting with the creative intelligentsia, is dangerous. This is why we must intensify party influence on all groups and movements. And we must do this in a truly deep manner. Not in the quiet of the offices, but in the thick of people and events.

In the national policy implemented by the CPSU we feel the life-giving breath of perestroika, the return to Leninist norms. This is greeted by all the residents of the republic. We must finally eliminate all those bends and prohibitions which distorted national relations in the years of Stalinism. We must rid ourselves of the stratification of show and, as we have already said by our honored guest, of the unification of friendship of peoples in the period of stagnation.

I would like to stress the importance of scientific atheism in our ideological work. However, the object of this work is man—an integral whole. And we must influence him also in a unified manner. As we know, there is one main connecting link. This is the unswerving longing for spirituality and morality of the people. The road to it leads also through the richness of culture, literature and art.

The national language of the current art is understood by all. This was once again confirmed by the Vilnius State Youth Theatre, which recently returned from a rather successful trip to the USA and Austria. The Lithuanian actors, embodying the intentions of the young but already famous producer Nekroshyus, in the last year presented the Russian Chekhov classic "Uncle Vanya" in the Lithuanian language, and staged the tragic parable on the fate of the Georgian artist Pirosmiani in different countries and different cities. And the viewers everywhere understood and loved it all. True art brings countries closer together and brings people together. It is no accident that I speak about art. Today in ideological work, as in art, we need personalities. Only then, like art, will we be able to achieve through scanty means a greater expressiveness in our endeavors, both large and small.

Speech by YA. S. FEDOROVICH, first secretary of the Trakay party raykom

We are living in an interesting time—in the period of perestroika, the renovation of society. What is happening today in our country is inevitable and positive change. In the dynamic and intensive political and economic life, new questions and problems are emerging every day which we must think over, evaluate, and find means of solving.

The 19th Party Conference and its decisions are the center of attention of communists and all the workers of our rayon. This was evidenced also by the meetings in the party organizations and labor collectives with the conference delegate and worker of the "Myarkis" experimental farm, Anton Daukshevich. People are concerned about the future fate of perestroika, economic reform, the resolution of social questions, and the role and importance of the party under new conditions. They all want one thing: for the new economic management mechanism to begin working as soon as possible and for the obstacles hindering perestroika to be overcome.

The positive tendencies in the course of the party are evident. We are all concerned about the events taking place in the country, republic, rayon, and in our own city and collective. However, Trakay residents are not satisfied with the situation which has emerged in Trakay and around it. The city of Trakay is well-known to many for its historical past and its natural beauty. It is called the pearl of Lithuania. Yet it is not easy for a person living in this city. The party has set the task of resolving the housing problem by the year 2000. The housing program is also an important means in the implementation of these current problems. Yet for the present day we see the fulfillment of this program as an unrealistic dream, because construction has practically ceased in the city for about 5 years.

Discussions are still going on in Trakay, and contradictory decisions are being made. In one resolution, the republic's Council of Ministers outlines the construction of housing and social-domestic facilities, especially in the period of preparations for the 650-year anniversary of Trakay. In another resolution—it rescinds and stops all this. The lack of continuity is manifested also in the actions of the Ministry of Culture, the Gosstroy and certain other republic institutions.

We understand that Trakay holds an exceptional place in the history of Lithuania. However, we must remember and care for those people who live there today, even though to them the city's past, its fate and its future are no less dear than they are to others. Historians, architects, and members of the initiative group of the Lithuanian Movement for Perestroika propose building housing and other facilities necessary to the city in other populated areas of the rayon. This, in practice, would mean displacing the people who were born here and who lived here their entire lives. There are around 500

families in the city on the waiting list to receive housing. The fate of Trakay is being determined by people who are practically not associated with the city. It is easy for them to judge and to be categorical. Yet we would like to find a compromise, to clarify once and for all the problems emerging around Trakay.

We need constructive decisions and the effective aid of certain republic ministries and departments. We must accept the concept of the future Trakay and be guided by it. Until we have a unified system of views and plans of activity, we will always encounter the same obstacles.

From time immemorial, people of different nationalities have lived in our rayon and experienced the joys and sorrows of fate. These were Lithuanians, Poles, Russians, Belorussians, Karaites, Tatars, and others. Today there are people of over 30 nationalities living in the rayon. There has never been any hatred between them, or any contraposition of one nation against the other. The ever expanding processes of glasnost and democratization have awakened the growth of national self-consciousness and the desire of each nation, even a small one, to gain a deeper knowledge of its beginnings, its historical roots, its culture and language. The party raykom has outlined a number of measures directed at the continued development of the culture of national groups living in the rayon, and the creation of the necessary conditions for this. This is primarily true of the Poles, Belorussians and Karaites. We know that groups for the aid of Polish and Karait culture have been created under the Republic Culture Fund.

Recently there has been widespread discussion of the further development of sovereignty of the Lithuanian republic and its national culture. We must applaud this. However, we cannot agree with those categorical demands which the council of the "Vi'niya" culture society is putting forth. Not having been to the rayon or studied the local situation there, the comrades are demanding that we correct the errors of the past by administrative methods, i.e., that we immediately restore Lithuanian schools or classes offering instruction in the Lithuanian language in part of the 9-year schools, that we study Polish instead of a foreign language, and Belorussian—optionally. We believe that these questions should be resolved only by democratic means. It is the parents who select the language of instruction. We cannot accept such categorical demands. Yet a similar pronouncement has resounded also at the last plenum of the Lithuanian CP Central Committee. We cannot follow such a path.

Evidently, these questions also arise partially because they are sometimes improperly illuminated in the press. We cannot agree with those publications in which the entire complex post-war period, a period of acute class struggle, is illuminated unilaterally, primarily in somber tones. This evokes the just indignation of the people who restored Soviet power in Lithuania and who rebuilt the destroyed national economy.

Recently in the press and television broadcasts there has been intensive fire aimed at the party apparatus. They call almost all the party workers bureaucrats. We are judged even by those who have a rather superficial understanding of party work, and who are not aware of its essence. In part this happens also because there is not enough glasnost in this question. We have literally stopped writing about party workers.

We would like to see the leaders of the republic speak out more often on the pages of the newspapers and on television, effectively giving an objective evaluation of the actual events. After all, sometimes we get the impression that there are only a few active supporters of groups favoring perestroika in the republic, who are constantly repeating the same ideas and slogans. They are resorting to open insults and distorting the objective situation without proposing any specific means of solving the problems.

Reports and elections have in practice begun in the rayon's party organization. Here the main discussion centers around the course outlined by the conference. It is a pity that as yet there is no new statute on the election of the party organs. We must also accelerate the reorganization of the party apparatus. We have given our suggestions on this question, but as yet we do not know what the outcome will be. We would hope that it will be the most optimal one, taking into account the conditions and specifics of activity of the party committees.

12322

Yakovlev Holds Question-Answer Session With Lithuanian Scientists

*18000651a Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian
14 Aug 88 pp 1-2*

[ELTA article entitled: "For Perestroika—Initiative and the Creative Thought of the Scientists" Question-answer session held by A. N. Yakovlev, CPSU Central Committee secretary and politburo member, with Lithuanian scientists]

[Text] On 11 August, a meeting was held at the Lithuanian SSR Academy of Sciences between the republic's scientists and CPSU Central Committee Politburo Member and CPSU Central Committee Secretary A. N. Yakovlev.

The meeting was opened by LiSSR Academy of Sciences President, Academician Yu. Pozhela.

Perestroika means not to build anew, but to rebuild that which we have, he said. Perestroika is the result of Soviet rule, and as we know, science in our republic has undergone great development during these years. We have extensive scientific cadres. There are 15,000 scientific workers in Lithuania. Of these, 550 are doctors of

sciences and 6,500 are candidates of sciences. They have been trained by Soviet science, with the help of scientists throughout the country. Thus, perestroika also has its own highly trained cadres.

Today we are faced with a very important question—to increase the initiative of scientists. Through the struggle with bureaucracy, through the democratization of our institutes, instilling a sense of high responsibility, we strive to achieve more. Naturally, a very important task for us is to develop the material-technical base of the academy, which is seriously lagging behind the current requirements.

What have we achieved in 3 years? Planning is done in an entirely different manner today in science—not by detail, but by individual directions. All the institutes have great capacities for showing off the initiative and abilities of individual associates. The Academy has taken on the function of introducing not only the developments, but also the studies of other institutes. We must say that things are going well with the realization of our scientific achievements. They are being introduced at over 1,000 enterprises throughout the country.

Today we are beginning to change the structure within the institutes. We are planning to transform the Institute of Zoology and Parasitology into the Institute of Ecology. We are creating an Institute of History and Culture and Art History. It is very important that we have received the support of the Lithuanian CP Central Committee in this endeavor. After all, the republic is especially in need of professionalism in the sphere of ecology and culture.

We consider it a very important fact that scientists, and particularly the intelligentsia in general, are showing increased social initiative. However, we still have an acute shortage of professional initiative.

One scientist noted that there is a rather low level of scientific rotation in our country. There is no exchange of scientific ideas and works at the necessary level, and there are few scientific conferences. It is as if the work is all being done in one kettle. We would like our scientists to have more opportunities to participate in exchange programs so as to improve themselves. We would also like the opportunity of hosting more specialists from institutes of other Soviet republics, as well as from abroad. This would provide mutual benefit. There is also much red tape in formulating travel permits for our scientists to go abroad. Also, unfortunately, the scientific life of the Academy is still strongly subject to regulation on the part of the State Committee on Science and Technology. In principle, the republic cannot independently participate in the formulation of the Academy of Sciences budget.

There are also many problems arising with democracy and glasnost. We will elect laboratory chiefs and directors at the academy. However, we have also an example

of another plane, when the delegates to the party conference were being selected. The people spoke out very actively at the institutes, presenting their candidates. However, the elections were held according to a list. We would not like to see this repeated at the elections of the party organs.

The question of who is the master in the republic is a very acute one. We believe that we should develop greater local independence. This is not nationalism, but rather the desire to see the republic be the most Soviet, the most socialist in our great Homeland. After all, an independent state would be happy at the discovery of oil, while atomic power is much cheaper than thermal. However, for this we need independence, so that we can ourselves show concern for operational safety, or order the most reliable construction projects.

E. Vilkas, the chief scientific secretary of the presidium, has introduced us to the development of the concept of cost accounting in the republic. On one hand, he said, we must ensure the sovereignty of the people so that they may implement full power on their territory, and on the other hand—we must remember and take into consideration the fact that the territory and the republic are part of the unified Soviet Union. Therefore, the mechanism that is in operation must not contradict the all-union one. As it turns out, the project which we prepared before the conference fully, and in some places even down to the letter, corresponds with the decisions of the conference. Its essence is that it brings not only the greatest economic results, but also gives satisfaction. Here we are referring to the fact that the republic is making its contribution to the provision of union programs in the sphere of defense, foreign and all-state policy, science, etc.

Commodity-monetary relations are undergoing great development. It does not do much good to change one administration for another. Scientists believe that there must also be union competency of general questions in the republic, but they should not be resolved without the agreement of the republic.

The reorganization of the apparatus has already been completed within the LiSSR Ministry of Public Education, and the workers have already set about their responsibilities, noted Minister G. Zabulis. The problem of the structure of the general education school emerges first of all. There is a proposal, which was presented in the speech of Lithuanian CP Central Committee Secretary L. K. Shapetis at the meeting of the republic party aktiv, to define the primary, basic, and final sections as 4, 6, and 2 years, respectively. Basic education is constructed on a period of 10 years.

[A. N. Yakovlev] If we examine the idea, which we have recently been implementing, although the conception is still absent. If students in the 9th and 10th grades could pick their subjects, we would lighten their load. Why

should one study everything? This teaches a person interests, and if he wants to study literature or physics and mathematics—let him study it.

[G. Zabulis] That is correct, but there are still very many problems here.

In the publishing business, I have had occasion to encounter such a technology where there are textbooks of union and republic competency. Even those which are written in the republic must be taken to Moscow and coordinated literally down to the letter. If they continue such patronage over us, we will again return to the situation of which we want to rid ourselves. Why must there be only one monopolistic textbook for each subject? After all, we can publish 4, maybe 5 such texts, and let the teacher choose. We have our own scientists—mathematicians, chemists, and physicists—who are capable of writing textbooks.

I would like to focus attention on the VUZes. We believe that the VUZ collectives should be given broader opportunities for publishing textbooks and instructional aids. This would significantly enrich our authorship capacities and help us with our instructional literature. We must necessarily give publication rights to Vilnius University. After all, almost all the country's universities have this right.

[L. Shepetis] I would like to add one thing. As far as the university is concerned, we are taking the question upon ourselves and resolving it without coordination. Today in the republic and in the country the situation is very difficult with computer technology, with the production of televisions and tape recorders, according to the general director of the scientific-production association "Venta."

[K. Klimashauskas] The government and the CPSU Central Committee have adopted a resolution on the development of computer technology. I will touch upon the problem of preparing specialists and science. Today we are getting only girls from the VUZes. They work primarily in production and in science. The young men go to work at the academic institutes, remain in the VUZes, or go to serve in the army. Someone had the bright idea of taking men from higher educational institutions into the army as rank-and-file soldiers. Many of them do not return to the VUZes, and lose their qualifications. Industrial enterprises and associates, if need be, will somehow maintain two departments of military training at their own expense. In general, the training of military men will not decline because of this.

[A. N. Yakovlev] I would like to answer this immediately. Recently the Politburo held a meeting concerning 13 VUZes. A commission was formed, but we do not yet know what conclusion it will come to. The discussions on this topic have dragged on for many years. We have various points of view. I support your suggestion that we

are sooner losing than gaining. The fellows, the electronics and physics technicians lose much of their specialty while serving 2 years in the army. They fall behind the current level of technology.

[K. Klimashauskas] As for applied and fundamental science, there are two different types of financing. We understand that without fundamental science there would be no projects for the flight to Mars. However, we must also resolve the projects which are so necessary to current production, and we have to wait a year, or two, or three. This, of course, is reflected in the technical level. We cannot delineate the fundamental and applied sciences. Let us create some kind of a fundamental-scientific-production association.

The current questions of the Lithuanian people in the past were discussed at the first conference of the republic's scientists, noted Institute of History Deputy Director A. Eydintas. However, there are still very many "gaps" in our history. Recent events in the republic have shown that historical science cannot answer all the emerging questions so competently. There are problems in explaining the situation of 1939-40's in the Baltic region. Part of the community does not trust the conception of synchronous revolutionary events in Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia. Of course, without coordination and cooperation with the centers of historical science in the entire Soviet Union, we will not be able to unravel Stalin's policy in the Comintern, his foreign policy errors, his agreement with fascist Germany, or his secret protocols. We must more openly expose the influence of Stalinism in the events of 1939-1941 in Lithuania and clearly delineate these phenomena from the basic principles of socialism which was built in the Baltic region. Silence and the repetition of superficial truths provides a good basis for our foreign opponents and their means of mass information. Historians are capable of explaining these processes, especially those which may be used for various nationalistic interpretations. As early as 1916, V. I. Lenin foresaw such a situation which, in my opinion, has arisen also in the Baltic region. After the socialist revolution has already taken place in the large state, a peaceful yielding of power by the bourgeoisie is possible in the small neighboring state. We are also concerned with the problem of the archives. At the party conference, and in general, there have been discussions that we should establish a term of 30-40 years for keeping archives. Upon the expiration of this time, they should be handed over to historians in their entirety, and not only part of the materials.

Moreover, the republic government must have certain funds at its disposal for financing urgent studies, as for example archeological studies or the publication of archival collections of documents.

LiSSR Academy of Sciences Vice President V. Statulyavichyus focused attention on the problems of ecology in the republic. Today the community considers and discusses this question as one of the primary ones. Various

ecology clubs have been formed in the republic. People are setting off on expeditions, travelling along the banks of the rivers and becoming convinced of the blatant mismanagement which is taking place.

A very difficult ecological situation has arisen in Lithuania for the plant and animal world, as well as for people. The giant industrial plants in Jonava, Kedainiai, and Akmenė have significantly undermined the environmental conditions. The power plant at Elektrėnai dumps 200 tons of pure sulphur into the atmosphere each day. The rivers are heavily polluted. There is almost no oxygen in Nėmūnas and in Kuršėnai Bay, and algae is developing at a rapid rate. Some of the beaches along the Lithuanian seashore had to be closed this summer due to pollution. We consider ourselves to be a cultured republic, but as yet Vilnius and Kaunas do not have biological sewage purification facilities.

Agroprom representatives usually tell us that we use only half of the amounts of chemical fertilizers used by the western countries. However, their composition is unbalanced, and the excess is absorbed by plants or gets into the water. Soil erosion is very dangerous. In some places in the republic the wind blows away large amounts of humus—the most fertile topsoil.

Science in the republic is not idle. We have developed an integrated scheme for environmental protection to the year 2000. A project for the protection of the Primorskiy region is being developed based on this scheme. The Institute of Chemistry and Chemical Technology has formed an association which has concentrated its efforts on developing closed-cycle heavy metal purification facilities. By 1990 we will not have a single machine tool building plant which dumps unpurified water. There is also a cooperative which will work on developing waste-free technologies for light industry.

The newly formed ecological center includes the university, institutes, the agricultural academy, and other scientific institutions.

A. N. Yakovlev has the floor.

Today our scientists are saying from all tribunals, and in general they are correct, that our ecology is not what it should be. Our technology is also not very well planned. Our power plants are not what they should be. In general, science does not recognize anything that would be considered acceptable. However, have we forgotten, dear comrades, that there is not a single project which does not bear the signature of either an institute or a scientific investigative committee? There is nothing in our country, including, I believe, the kitchen faucet, which was not developed at institutes and design bureaus, and which does not bear the mark of science. I believe that it would be fair not only to hold the critical string taut. We have every reason also for repentance. And without repentance, my dear comrades, we cannot move ahead. Let us repent, and maybe this will help us to feel our own

responsibility. Let me cite one example, associated with ecology. When I worked in the propaganda department of the CPSU Central Committee in the 70's, I intervened in defense of KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, which had spoken out on the Baykal question. I wrote a note to the Secretariat saying that KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA had formulated the question correctly. The question was taken up by the Central Committee Secretariat. There they told me that I was engaging in a political strip tease. Why? As it turns out, because I had supported KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA. National economic interests, they said, must prevail. They issued a reprimand to the editor-in-chief of KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA. This was very disappointing, but we were saved by one candidate of sciences. He was going through the Baykal making a film. The film was very simple, but quite expressive and truthful. I remember from this film how they put little fish in a test tube filled with Baykal water, and they immediately died. So, it was demonstrated quite clearly what kind of water this was. I was able to get Brezhnev to view this film, and he was a sentimental man. He felt sorry for these little fish, and again presented the question to the Politburo. They created a commission headed by Academician Zhavoronkov. Again there was a meeting of the Politburo, and Zhavoronkov spoke out at it, saying that all this was rubbish, that the combine plant had to remain on the Baykal, and that nothing should be done. This was in 1969-1970. Who decided this fate? The scientist can appeal to conscience or not—now it is too late. And what about the atomic power plants? Who was it that played us for the fool for decades? It was everywhere the scientific investigative commissions. Supposedly there were those who at that time expressed their disagreement, but where has science registered and expressed this disagreement? There is no such record of this. All the projects were sanctioned by science and created by science.

Please understand me correctly, comrades. I have no intention of placing the responsibility for all misfortunes upon you. Here we must all keep our heads. However, science is science, and you must present higher requirements. Science is the intellectual head of the nation, and it must be a responsible head.

Let us not make any more such mistakes in science. Let us approach the next expert investigations with conscience, so that our scientific conscience will be clear. Yet, as I understand it, our science has worked on compromises for the past decades. It is more or less clear to me why this has been the case with the social sciences. It was the product of the social conditions. But why was it that applied science, if not all, then a notable portion of it, also worked on compromises? That is what I don't understand. Of course, I understand the fear after Weismannism-Morganism, and cybernetics. However, all this was somewhat corrected even in those years. And we did have some scientists with a clear conscience, but on the whole we lived and worked on compromises. We consoled ourselves with the fact that we had democratic

conditions at our academies, that we have a secret ballot. Then we began conspiring: you vote for my candidate today, and I'll vote for yours tomorrow. We began engaging not in science, but in petty intrigues around science. I believe we must speak of perestroika also as it applies to science, primarily so that this part of society will be the most conscientious. Of course, none of us will object that all society must be conscientious. We must strive toward this and achieve it. However, comrades, for science this requirement is absolute. Without it there simply is no science.

Yet things are still not going too well with this. How are we reorganizing at present? If you listen—there are such "reorganizations" going on in Moscow and in the republics: how to elect, whom to appoint, where to transfer. Are we going in the right direction? Once again we have focused our attention on some bureaucratic level. And this is in science. For example, I used to be the director of an institute. Whenever foreigners asked how many people worked in our institute, I always named half the true figure. And all of you know, dear comrade directors, that if we refer to the number of those who actually work, and not simply those who report for work, your situation is about the same. Yet we are speaking of staffing. I was clever.. I had less than the staff roster working for me, even though the institute was the Institute of World Economics and International Relations. Out of 1,017 persons at this institute, I could literally list by name those who truly, with calling, engaged in scientific activity. I would name about 200 people. This institute is considered to be one of the strongest of all social science institutes by its potential. Yet there are institutes where you have to seek high and low to find someone who actually engages in science. This is where our problem lies—how to return science to science. I am constantly amazed by some of the letters which I receive in my current capacity. Well, what is this: scientists who want to solve scientific problems through the party Central Committee? When they get tired of working through the party Central Committee, when they think that it is useless, then they will go through the KGB, and so on.

Since when do we, union science, begin to solve scientific problems through some institutions? What kind of scientists are these? Let us cleanse ourselves, comrades. Real scientists work. They have students. And here no structures hinder them. The task of this structure—of the directors, deputies, academy apparatus and presidium—is not to interfere with the scientists. This, in my opinion, is the purpose for which the academy was created.

I don't know how it is in your republic, but I believe the Academy of Sciences is a ministry. All of the questions it deals with are centered around science. Could it be that they have become afraid of science? Is this normal when the director of an institute employing 10,000 persons speaks out for 15 years and always says—we have fallen behind?... By the way, you have 100 people in your Institute of History. For history, this is a huge institute.

If you had 7 scientific historians and at least half of them were Tarliers or at least one was a Manfred, for example, do you know how world famous you would be? Yet you have 100 people! A 100 historians!

In general, we have become accustomed to a very high level—10,000 writers, 20,000 artists, many thousands of cinematographers, I don't remember exactly how many. And probably even statistics do not know for sure the true number of scientists in the country. Comrades, something is wrong here. Together we must define how science can and must return to its own circles. Today the Academy of Sciences has prepared proposals on the development of the fundamental sciences. I don't know if it consulted with you or not. We in the party Central Committee believe that this is currently a basic task in science. If we are able to move ahead with the fundamental sciences, then evidently there is hope. We had the following illusion: we have a stockpile, we have major developments which are strictly theoretical, but industry is not accepting them. It is difficult to drill these kilometers or strata down to production. Yet, as it turns out, upon close examination we have fallen behind in the fundamental sciences. We have nothing to brag about. One, two, and that's it. We must begin everything from fundamental science. This means—again money, laboratories, experimental production, equipment, and training of cadres. You yourselves understand that all this will not yield results tomorrow. This is a matter for the future. But for now, everything rests on you. Why do I speak so critically? It is because of disappointment over the fact that we are doing less than we can. Of course, we do have some wonderful scientific collectives, some wonderful scientists who are ready and willing to work. We must simply create normal conditions for them. And, I repeat: We must not bother them.

Yet quite often we see the following case: one part is working, the other is hindering it. We have been trying to resolve this "dialectical contradiction" for 70 years. It would be good to break this tie which has hindered workers. In my opinion, the distinguishing feature of perestroika is to create such conditions that every one would work and answer for what he is doing. You speak of formulating permits to travel abroad. I don't know why there are such delays, but in my opinion this is something that the academy should resolve. Aside from the Academy of Sciences, no one has the right to interfere in travel permits. When I get home, I will talk this over with G. I. Marchuk.

I have heard and am concerned by the fact that you do not have enough money for holding discussions.

[Yu. Pozhela] It is not that we do not have enough money for conferences. We need to have the decision of the Council of Ministers as to what conferences are to be held in the current year.

[A. N. Yakovlev] The only reliable means of successful scientific research is discussion. Mankind has not thought of any other way. That is your main task.

[A. Zhukauskas] The Committee on Science and Technology gives permission to hold the conference, and in must be in the plan.

[A. N. Yakovlev] And do you compile the plan?

[A. Zhukauskas] No. The Committee on Science and Technology approves it.

[A. N. Yakovlev] I will look into it. Do you know why I am surprised? I have worked in science. No one ever planned any conferences for me. I planned and conducted them myself.

Yu. Pozhela] We won't get a single room at the hotel if the conference is not in the plan.

A. N. Yakovlev] Let the deputy director of the institute look into this. I have worked as institute director. Not once did I ever have the need to turn to the Academy of Sciences Presidium with such a request. The Academy of Sciences Presidium was happy that I did not turn to it. I promise to get to the bottom of this matter for you. In my opinion, this is an extreme expression of absurdity.

As far as archives are concerned, this is an extremely complex matter, especially under the conditions in our country. We have accumulated many different archives. Recently some people in our party demanded that the Comintern archives be opened up. We decided that we would open the Comintern archives for the party. We announced this to the fraternal parties. And what do you think? Not one of them agreed with this. Except for one point—you will show our documents to us, but to others you will not. This really is their business, whether or not to open up the documents of their own party.

The situation with our own internal archives is even more complex. We have to work on them. Our archives are in a state of neglect. There are documents from 1917, from the revolution, and from the civil war which have still not been studied. Not all of them are rotting in Moscow. Yet in the oblasts they often lie around, tied up in sacks. No one there looks at them. We would like to seriously examine archival matters, but here again there are problems. We must build a building and scientifically organize the matter. We need computer technology. Today a storehouse is being built for old books which are currently being stored in 14 churches in Moscow. We must preserve these books, among which there are some very unique ones of only 2-3 copies. We must preserve them all.

As for the social sciences, quite often the requirements are set too high for them. I am also in favor of their more rapid development. We must admit that social science must find facts for its conclusions. If physicists discover

a particle, it does not depend on the social and political order. Monarchy or freedom are all the same to them. Yet social science lives in a specific society. Over a period of many decades, we have turned social science into a complimentary and commenting science. And it is hard to blame scientists for this. That was the demand of society. They say that today they are reorganizing slowly. Well, what faith would we have in the scientist if it were like this: today they announce perestroika, and in the morning he will already have reorganized, and began writing something entirely different. Yesterday he wrote that Stalin was the most genial of all the genial military leaders, and today he must write everything just the opposite. What faith would we have in that kind of a scientist? Give him a little time to come to his senses. A new generation of scientific workers must develop with unclouded consciences, because in social science, if it really is a science, it is a serious matter to deny one's convictions. For example, I have more trust for those scientific cadres who, perhaps incorrectly but firmly, hold fast to their positions. I may not agree with them, but I must, I am obliged, to morally respect them for this. We must nevertheless understand that we need time to surge ahead. I believe that we have departed from the main principle in social science. We begin all our scientific research in social science with an ideal, i.e., with the anticipated end result. Then we look for facts, the facts which will correspond to this ideal. Science is built according to a different principle. We must proceed from the facts, from reality, and from its analysis. And what will become of this ideal—that we must view through the result of the scientific study. I did not think of this. It was Marx who thought of it. We have simply forgotten it. Therefore, we must now turn social science toward fact, toward actual reality and toward its analysis.

Only we must not shout "go for it." In science, and not only in science, we must have more patience. Perestroika rejects the past—Stalinism, its methods, and the entire system associated with it. It is as if other people are now conducting perestroika. I recently called the newspapermen of Moscow to repentance. Why don't you be self critical and hang a page from a 7-year old newspaper next to the paste-up of the column for today's paper which you have just written? Take a look at what you wrote. You will be a bit ashamed, and perhaps you will evaluate a bit more fairly.

Three years of perestroika have passed. Has anything changed? They say no, it has not changed. First of all, this is untrue. All society has changed. You and I have all changed. Many things have changed. Yet in ecology nothing will change quickly, no matter how much you and I talk about it. At least we should not repeat stupid mistakes. Purification facilities may resolve many things, but nevertheless we have to introduce a different, more reliable, waste-free technology. This is where we must look for science.

When Lenin wrote about sovereign republics, he said that only two questions comprise all-union interests—defense and foreign policy. Here is what I think: defense—that is understandable, but foreign policy...

Representatives of the correspondent corps, the diplomatic corps, trips abroad... Today we are breaking with what has been established. Why not accredit newspaper correspondents if you can pay for them? That is what cost accounting is for.

Concluding his presentation, Comrade A. N. Yakovlev wished the republic's scientists success in solving the problems of perestroika.

Comrades R. Songayla, N. A. Mitkin, V. Sakalauskas, L. Shepetis, and K. Zaletskas were also present at the meeting.

12322

Yakovlev Meets With Representatives of Lithuanian Intelligentsia

*18000651b Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian
14 Aug 88 pp 2-3*

[ELTA article entitled: "Duty and Responsibility of the Creative Intelligentsia"]

[Text] On 11 August, Comrade A. N. Yakovlev visited the Museum of Applied Arts. There, the guest was acquainted with the rich collections of ceramics, tapestries, furniture, rugs, and metal work of the 18th-early 20th centuries, as well as with the works of masters from the Soviet period. R. Burdis, director of the LiSSR Art Museum, showed the exhibit to the guest.

In the guest book, Comrade A. N. Yakovlev wrote: "Only whole people, people of high moral character preserve the memory of the past so carefully. This is a memory not only of those cultures and peoples who have gone, but also the memory of the future, since it is there, in the future, that they will strictly judge us, our culture, our honor and dignity. Your museum is an example both of pride and repentance. I wish you success! Thank you!"

After that, A. N. Yakovlev met at the Palace of Workers of the Arts with representatives of the creative intelligentsia and the means of mass information. Comrades R. Songayla, N. A. Mitkin, V. Sakalauskas, K. Shepetis, K. Zaletskas, and other official party and Soviet workers were present at the meeting.

"We have gathered here to discuss some very important aspects in our current life, and to talk about perestroika," said V. Martinkus, chairman of the republic's Union of Writers governing board, as he opened the meeting. "We have come to talk frankly, to share our ideas about the processes which are taking place in our life, and about our complex and contradictory life."

I believe it is a regular occurrence that the intelligentsia has become one of the most active forces in perestroika. We cannot get along without deep and creative thought. How are we doing at this? Are we strong enough to bear

the burden which time places upon us? Have we gotten the answers to all our questions at the party conference? How can we, the republic's creative intelligentsia, do everything possible to bring the decisions of this conference to life?

I believe that the first steps in this direction have already been taken, both jointly, i.e., all together, and separately, i.e., in each artists' union and organization. For example, the changes of the new thinking are quite notable in the technological, economic, and state spheres. Life is viewed differently, and there are different demands for morals. This was facilitated also by the comments of our scientists, writers, pedagogs, and leaders in art. In essence, we have never spoken so openly in our press about the history of Lithuania, about its most acute and saddest pages, about the exiles and repressions in 1941 and in the post-war years, and about the bitter fruits of the hasty collectivization. Our publicistic and essay writing have finally broken out to the forefront. Changes, positive changes, have emerged in in social consciousness. Political and social ideals have been reborn, and the inertness of thought has been overcome.

The movement for perestroika was organized in our republic in early July. We are gladdened by the fact that this is form of social activity which is not being imposed by anyone on anyone else. This movement is led by a volunteer group of 36 people—active leaders in our culture. Almost one-third of them are also present here at our meeting. Among them are people's poets Yustinas Martinkavichyus, Alfonsas Maldonis; honored cultural leaders—writers Vitautas Bubnis, Vitautas Petkevichyus, and others. Obviously, the movement is a contradictory process. It has its difficulties. It also has some aspects which put us on guard, and some of them already today look dangerous. However, in its essence this movement is in harmony with perestroika.

Perestroika has elevated the criterion of artistic nature. In my opinion, there is only one essence of our search. Art presents questions about the moral responsibility of man under current conditions, about the sense of his life, about the possibilities of his survival. Art poses the question of the real possibilities of humanism in our socialist society.

After this, A. N. Yakovlev, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and CPSU Central Committee secretary, spoke.

"Here I am, looking at my long-time acquaintances. I would not say that they have gotten better looking, nor that they have gotten younger," said A. N. Yakovlev. "Time passes. Today, in my opinion, it simply flies. We must travel the truly untrodden paths of perestroika and build a new society. We must perform that which we call renovation, revolutionary transformation."

I always ponder the fact, and I would like to say in this regard specifically here in this auditorium: We still retain the character of thought in which we ask questions and hope that someone will recognize this tomorrow, these coming events, for us. I think, and I ask you: But what will the party do tomorrow? What else has it thought up? Perhaps the writers, cinematographers, journalists, and artists themselves will suggest something? Particularly from the main positions of perestroika, from the positions of the main revolutionary transformation, from the positions of building a moral society, with all of its components.

We are currently being pressed by everyday affairs. There is a shortage of consumer goods, there is not enough housing, the roads are poor, etc. Often party workers say that supposedly it is not we who are at fault here, but the past. In a calendar sense this is correct, but it does not absolve us of responsibility today. The account of responsibility is growing. Three years have passed, and we cannot use forever the credit of trust which has been issued to us. After all, we will have no one to blame but ourselves. We must give answers to all of these questions.

What will the situation be with food products? At the last Plenum we said: "Let's have lease agreements." This principle decision does not mean, of course, any decollectivization. However, along with other types of order, as for example the family order, agricultural companies and combines, this is a very serious shift in our political-theoretical thinking. In other words, we are changing over to different forms of realization of socialist ownership. Before we viewed cooperation as the lowest form, and the sovkhoz—as the highest. Today there is no such division. This is true not only of agriculture, but also of industry. We are speaking not only of leasing small and medium enterprises, but also large ones. As you can see, we must approach this very seriously. This is not to mention cost accounting, self-financing, self-sufficiency, etc.

We will soon be holding a Plenum on international relations. We must prepare seriously for it. We must study this question seriously. There we will discuss questions of the status of republics, autonomy, and other national formations. We must resolve them fairly and in accordance with the times in which we live, and with an understanding of the essence of our union state at the current stage. Obviously, the questions of language, culture, etc. will find resolution.

Questions are arising about the youth. I believe that truthful upbringing has a great effect on the youth. This has yielded its own very serious positive results. You see and feel this on yourselves. The processes taking place in the consciousness is deep and rather quick. Well, young people too want to live and understand current problems, their future, and their place in society. But are we giving the young people this place? Do we ourselves understand it? After all, this is a very serious question—

political, ideological, psychological and social. I believe that we have no such understanding. Let us take, for example, a question that is always on our minds and in our sights—the question of the intelligentsia. Each of us can stand up and say that these relations, to put it mildly, have not always been intelligibly structured in terms of common sense, and very often quite the opposite.

It is not so important, who is for or who is against what. Of course, any relations are realized through our intellect, but I am speaking now of something else. The fact is that all of us bear the trappings of the past. How can we break free of them? How can we shake them off? Here is an example which made a very great impression on me. It was a question of films, but not just that. Once it turned out that cinematography began a very great push to release those films. There are 20 of them (at least I was 20), about which I had not the slightest notion prior to this. I was far removed from this discussion. And so I thought: It could not be that they would simply ban them for nothing. I began viewing these films on Saturdays and Sundays. I had probably seen enough to last me my whole lifetime. And, you know, I didn't find a single thing in any of the 20 films. I even tried to catch myself: well, let there at least be some prejudice. Well, find something, at least for in-house discussion. I found nothing. They spoke of the anti-patriotic nature of "Inspection Along the Roads," but to me this Herman film seemed very patriotic. There were some films which were simply weak, but it was not for their weakness that they were banned. And so they released them, and no one even sighed. The roof over Soviet power did not even buckle, much less collapse. The press roused itself a bit. Of course, they praised the films (that which is banned is always praised), and then they grew silent.

Or how about the novels which were left to lie around? The most characteristic one, in my opinion, was Bek's "New Appointment." I remember the incident around which this entire mess grew. Then it was elevated to a political topic. It is a good novel with interesting events. Then there is "Children of the Arbat." Well, that is fine. Some like it, some don't. But you understand, all of this was done with a writer's hand. Only now is it fashionable to say: those scoundrels there in the apparatus sat around and controlled everything. Yet if we look at the reviews, which were closed as well as open, they were all signed, including also by leading writers. Therefore, comrades, today I would like to say: sometimes it doesn't hurt to have a strong sense of repentance both in today's actions, as well as in our evaluations of the past. This is true for all of us.

Today one group is supposedly guilty, while another supposedly is not, not at all. Still a third group supposedly observed then and is observing even now. No, comrades. Let us be a little more fair, and this means—let us have a little morality. The situation is what it is, and it involves even talented people, not only the grey artisans. There can be a situation by conviction, by deep personal conviction. I once had occasion to debate with

Kochetov. We clashed sharply. I still do not agree with his position, his ideology, or his approaches. However, at the time he amazed me with his conviction. He sincerely believed, and some of his comrades also said that they sincerely believed, yet in fact they did not believe in anything. They are still alive, and do not believe in anything.

However, this is about the past. But what about now? I will return to where I started. It would be a great pity if our artistic intelligentsia lets these years slip by without creating something significant in an artistic sense. Of course, now we must write in a different manner, and evidently this explains the hesitation. Neither the plots nor the themes fit. We need something else, something stemming from a deep interpretation of the psychological drama which our people experienced. It is a drama about what happened with our fathers and grandfathers, about what the war did to them, and what happened after the war—stagnation. We might say that we calmly observed, but bore all of this inside of ourselves. All this lived somewhere inside us and struggled with something. What are we to do with it now? After all, none of you will do this. No one. Let us present a human drama, and not a very synonymous one at that! Isn't it primitive that this one was a scoundrel, that this one was a criminal, everything classified so neatly? This one was a decent man, but, you see, he never expressed his opinion about anything, and didn't even write any denunciations. What a hero! If you read our literary journals more or less attentively, this begins to disturb you. After all, we are going into our fourth year of perestroika!

Many people say to me: "Cinematography has not changed much." Yet I believe that nothing has changed much except for publicistic and documentary literature. There are some good stories and short novels. Yet they still lack depth of the human soul. You will say to me: "But where will we find a Tolstoy, or better still a Dostoyevskii, for our time?" But then who will? Come on, let us try to do this ourselves. It is time, comrades.

We still have to fight hard for perestroika. Comrades, we have just entered the heat of this battle. Conservatism is fading step by step, but at some point it will begin to show greater resistance. We should not overlook this. We have to sense this moment.

Perestroika must create new spiritual values. The people will ask not only of the leaders and of the bureaucrats. The people will demand equally from everyone. In general they will not care what dramas we experienced. They want to read books, see film, look at pictures, admire and delight, and share the experience. They have a right to this.

I will say honestly that I am constantly tortured by the following torment. Comrades, you must show this perestroika in the same way as you called it forth, with your own efforts. And you must do so not just with speeches and meetings. I spoke frankly with Sergey Pavlovich

Zalygin. It was wonderful. Sergey Pavlovich, my dear one, you told me everything, explained all the points on ecology, cleared everything up on paper. But further, you must write a novel in such a way as to make people shudder. Then everyone will suddenly become your ally. And when the leading writer Yriy Vasilyevich Bondarev says that the bureaucrats will finally demolish and destroy us, I say to him: put it in a novel and nail it down in such a way as to make us all shudder.

Amidst the appeals, dear comrades, it is time to gladden our people with that which is our spiritual and professional duty to the people. I certainly do not want to tell you that you should retreat from perestroika politically. God forbid. The intelligentsia has made a great contribution to this entire matter. Perhaps some of the redoubts would still stand more firmly in the path of perestroika had it not been for the press and the intelligentsia. You see what has happened.

However, in general it is not working out badly, comrades. No matter how we scold ourselves—there is something we did not finish, something missing here and there—nevertheless, society is changing. I ask you to simply take my word for it, that in 1985, I remember, we sat at the April Plenum. We had some ideas stored up from all the previous non-acceptance of what was going on, and we proceeded from this non-acceptance. Everything that came of these positive ideas stemmed from the fact that things should not be done this way. That was clear. Yet if someone had told me then that there would be a January Plenum on democracy, I would not have believed him. If someone had told me that there would be such a 19th Party Conference, I would not have believed even a month before it actually happened, let alone in 1985. And so, let us remember and fix in our minds that about which we speak today, how we discuss, what our form of thinking is, and let us recall all this in a year. In a year we will be absolutely different, and time will go even faster. Who will write about this? Who will depict it? In what pictures? In what tapes?

You will probably ask about a signature sheet in the questions and in the presentations. Maybe I should answer ahead of time. There is no such paper. Where will we find it if the question is still unclear?

I am often asked about problems of language and national culture. I am convinced that the upcoming Plenum will seriously resolve these questions. We must accumulate a certain charge all together. Sometimes certain problems seem to present themselves to us in a certain way, but when we meet them head-on—they have an entirely different spark.

The proclaimed glasnost at first did not stand the test of Chernobyl, and then democratization collided with the problem of Nagorniy Karabakh, said the editor-in-chief of the newspaper GIMTASIS KRASHTAS, writer A.

Chekuolis. Ultimately, we had to speak about one and the other, but with explanation. In both cases we lost much in terms of propaganda.

Now, it turns out, we pass on positive processes. I am referring to the socio-political movement which has emerged in the Prebaltic republics in support of the perestroika proclaimed by the party. I would like to stress the fact that the Lithuanian movement for perestroika emerged on the eve of the 19th Party Conference, when each of us shared the well-founded concern for its fate. I believe that the fact that tens of thousands of our fellow citizens came to the largest town squares to greet and see off the delegates is indicative of the political face of this movement. How should we evaluate the deathly silence of the central press, radio and television concerning this movement? Is it a disagreement with it? Is it a fear of it? Is it suspicion? Let us not pretend that we don't know what they are afraid of in the movement. They are afraid of maximalism and separatism. These fears are stereotypes of the past.

As never before, the people thirst for and are ready to implement Soviet rule in practice. This readiness is expressed in not allowing the elections to be held in the old manner, in not accepting openness in the old manner, cost accounting in the old manner, and national relations in the old manner. It is a readiness to help the ideas of a democratic legal state to grow. Yet how should we understand the emergence of the Directive on Demonstrations and Meetings in this situation? Our meeting democracy is directed against the indirectness of the management organs—those very same offices where, it turns out, we must now go to get permission. The text of the directive allows a very broad interpretation. We convincingly ask you to take measures to significantly change this directive, as the law on progressive taxation of cooperatives was changed.

We can use technical and economic levers for improving the economy. We can also achieve high indicators through man, through exposing his creative potential. Only true Soviet democracy will allow us to do this.

Today the nucleus of the movement, its initiative group, is the intelligentsia. Yet its backbone, its main force, is comprised of the workers in the factories and plants. There are Russians, Poles and Jews participating in this movement. We propose that this force be used for perestroika. We must take our force as a weapon, and not apply the brakes in every way possible. The fact that extremists are trying to associate themselves with the movement is not a trend. They are one in a thousand, and we have already learned to cast them off. It is the communists, the deputies, the writers and scientists who created the movement. They created it to strengthen the party line in perestroika. Communists were elected to its leadership. We can order the communists to leave the movement. There are rayons where this order has

already been given. Then who will lead this movement, and where will it go? After all, the people do not want to reconcile themselves with the old and to live in the old manner.

A. Chekuolis presented a version of the crime in which the student M. Yuknyavichyus was wounded. An ELTA report on this matter was published in the republic newspapers on 13 August.

[A. N. Yakovlev] As far as glasnost is concerned, we can probably agree both about Chernobyl and about Karabakh.

The first thunder of Chernobyl was heard on Friday. The information which came in was so contradictory, that we really did not understand what had happened. The Politburo met on Friday, and it met again on Saturday. On Saturday a governmental commission was created to tour the site. No one was ready for this. The question of information arose. But what actually happened? On Sunday the Politburo met again. I will tell you that the very first recommendations were not the ones, including the scientific ones, which we finally adopted. All our atomic scientists were summoned to the Politburo, and they all said different things. Then they began discussing the information. By Tuesday it finally did come in. So you say that we lost out on information. Yet, if you look through all the information that was printed abroad—it was really awful. The NEW YORK TIMES wrote: "There are thousands of bodies lying in the streets, with no one to pick them up." I don't know whether our information could have corrected this report. This was a conditional matter. To judge the past in this case would merely be conjecture. It probably could have.

Our first thoughts were—what should we do about Kiev? There are millions of people there. Which way will the wind shift? It was a good thing it was not blowing toward Kiev. Should we evacuate Kiev or not? That is what we were concerned with. Then we began receiving information every day. Of course, it would have been better if it had been earlier, but at that time I felt no specific losses in this sense. The problems were entirely different.

Karabakh. If we analyze the information from there, it looked like this: up—down, collapse—up, collapse—up. Where were these collapses coming from? It was from the persistent requests of both republics. Whatever the central press printed, one side was always unhappy. Many thousands of people took to the streets for demonstrations. People are waiting for the truth, but from there we get requests—just don't report anything, not even anything positive. We had to decide. Should we inform the people about what was going on, or should we try to prevent possible complications?

V. Maynelite, honored actress of the republic, touched upon the sore points of the actor's labor wage, which is not commensurate with the work performed.

Professor Yu. Yuzelyunas, chairman of the Public Commission for Investigating the Crimes of Stalinism, recalled the facts of repressive tyranny. Terrible crimes were committed against the Lithuanian people in the years of Stalinism. The death of the "father of peoples" in 1953 put an end to this mass nightmare, although individual cases also occurred later. Aside from the mass deportations, a huge number of people were exterminated in camps.

There was open violation not only of the Lithuanian SSR Constitution, but also all other standards of legality. However, even to this day there is discrimination against the people who were returned to Lithuania. Their rights are infringed upon, and particularly their acceptance for work. In our opinion, only those persons should be individually rehabilitated against whom there were at least some kind of court proceedings. Why should those who were repressed without a trial or investigation, and without any legal basis, have to seek individual rehabilitation? In focusing attention on this matter, we ask you to present to the CPSU Central Committee the question of collective rehabilitation of all USSR citizens who were repressed without a trial or investigation during the period of Stalinism, and to issue a Directive of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium to that effect. We believe that the collective resolution of this acute and important question will significantly facilitate the increased trust by society in the process of perestroika.

Yu. Yuzelyunas expressed puzzlement at the fact that the Central Committee resolution adopted in 1948 on formalism in music in connection with Muradelli's opera "Great Friendship" is still in effect.

[A. N. Yakovlev] No, that resolution has been rescinded.

[Yu. Yuzelyunas] But some still employ it...

[A. N. Yakovlev] Some still employ Stalinism even to this day. Yet this resolution was rescinded by decision of the Central Committee.

In regard to what you said at the beginning, of course it is a tragedy. I am a member of the Politburo Commission on Rehabilitation. You probably read about the results from time to time. The commission has selected an unhurried pace as its principle of operation in determining people's fates. We want to decide each case fairly. Yet nothing is simple. Take, for example, the Yagoda case. What a scoundrel! And the fact that he was executed was correct. He deserved it. Yet we were obliged to rehabilitate him in a specific case, because in the Bukharin case, like Bukharin himself, he had not the slightest connection. There are many such contradictions which arise between emotions and the law.

We still have over 60 groups of cases to review, about which, I am convinced, neither you nor I have the slightest notion. We haven't gotten to them yet. And how many more are there locally? We have ordered the local

party organs to look into them also. This is a great tragedy. There are questions here also on the Baltic region, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, 1941 and 1949.

You would support us if you did not try to rush us. We want to bring everything thoroughly to its end, to draw a conclusive line under all the rehabilitation cases. And we will do so.

I like your formula. Everyone says—Stalin, but you are a professor of Stalinism. Comrades, the problem is that we still do not completely understand Stalinism. We must struggle, oppose, study, and draw conclusions from Stalinism.

The intelligentsia greatly supports perestroika, said republic people's writer M. Slutskis. For the first time we have leaders who do not bang their fists on the table at the intelligentsia, who recognize its contribution both to the country's spiritual and political life. This imposes a high responsibility.

However, both you and I, of course, are a little embarrassed by the fact that there are still no works emerging which would reflect—obviously already in a new meaning and with new depth—the very important processes. Yet nothing will come of someone trying to hurry someone else along in the field of art. It is not because we do not want to, but because there is so very much to think about.

Here an actress spoke about various confusions of everyday life. Well, the intelligentsia has become accustomed to being patient in this regard. Yet we observe life and sense the mood. How much patience will people have to wait on various confusions? This is an important question—to more decisively transform social provision.

Questions about the youth are also associated with this. The fact is that we must widen the road, so that the young people would know the prospects of what can be achieved if they devote all their energies to their labor and to their purpose. I liked what Granin wrote in PRAVDA about Snechkus. One of the achievements of Snechkus was that it promoted young talent. It is specifically for this reason that the situation in Lithuania looks somewhat better. This is one of the decisive matters for perestroika.

So as not to take up too much time, I would like to ask you, Aleksandr Nikolayevich: What is your opinion on Afanasyev's 26 July article in PRAVDA and the commentaries on it?

[A. N. Yakovlev] I will start with the simple basics. When the commentary affirms that there was no alternative in society during Stalinism, this, of course, will not do. What do they mean, there was no alternative? Why such a foredoom for Stalinism? It is a well-known thesis, and it passes sometimes. It has found its reflection even here, and with this I cannot agree.

As for Yu. Afanasyev's article, I would view it in the context of his other speeches. No matter how you characterize Stalin's period, you still cannot find the words for it. But when he begins to say that perestroika is not socialistic enough, I must hold to different positions. I believe that what perestroika is doing, right now, on the whole, in principle, and in its primary directions—is socialistic. And our primary goal consists of returning the socialist nature to society and to socialism. I must argue with those who maintain that we are still living in the epoch of Stalin, that we have not yet overcome anything, that the non-socialist nature of the measures stems from this. Here I see the association of such affirmations with the conservative thought of those who also accuse perestroika of being non-socialist in nature, but only from the other side. They say: "Oh, cooperation—no!" That is because Lenin at one time had some philippics against cooperative socialism. "Oh, individual activity—that is bourgeois. Oh, you understand, here is something in the direction of capitalism, in the direction of concessions to the West." I must argue with those who begin to accuse perestroika of not being socialistic. Here is my point of view. Present here is one of the authors of the response—Comrade Otto Latsis, first deputy editor-in-chief of the journal *KOMMUNIST*. He is a man who during the period of stagnation suffered and was removed from work, a man whom we cannot accuse of trying to adapt. He was a fighter in his time. And this is much more valuable than today tossing philippics against Brezhnev.

V. Petkyavichyus, prosaic and honored cultural leader, asks to be recognized.

"In the past I was a Komsomol and party worker, but now I am a writer who has not sat down at his desk for 6 months," he said. "There is no time to write. I was elected in absentia to the movement for perestroika. I work there as much as I can."

V. Petkyavichyus told of the main directions of activity of the movement for perestroika. "The intelligentsia and all of us," he said, "were shaken up by Yu. Yarmalavichyus's article in the newspaper *TIYESA*—the Lithuanian variant of Andreyeva's article. There were other anti-perestroika comments as well. Many unresolved questions were adding up. The people were worried about the slow rate of perestroika in the republic. That is why our movement arose. We thought for a long time, and communists consulted with our leadership. We found no other way out. We had to awaken some kind of public support for perestroika."

"Why does the ecological situation worry us now? Lithuania is located in the Nyamunas Basin. If the Nyamunas perishes—we have nowhere to go. We are already drinking polluted water. The union ministry is currently planning a plant which will manufacture cement, burning thousands of tons of tire coverings. We must seriously and immediately solve the ecological problems."

"SOVETSKAYA LITVA has spoken out, saying that our meetings resound with nationalist slogans. Why, there are hundreds of thousands of people participating in our meetings and in our crusade. Yet there has not been a single act of an anti-Russian demonstration, not one! We go to the labor collectives. They support us there without any national differentiation, because we all live in one republic."

V. Petkyavichyus expressed doubt as to the current status of the Central Committee second secretaries in the republics.

"I would also like to focus your attention on agriculture. After all, our agriculture bears a colonial character. It is a harvest for the sake of the harvest. We have exhausted the soil, and soil erosion processes are ongoing. What will happen later?"

[A. N. Yakovlev] In regard to Andreyeva's article, here is how I view this problem. There were others like her who spoke out before, but not from such a platform. In this case we decided to give an answer to the Politburo and to express our point of view. The response in *PRAVDA* is our platform, the Politburo. However, comrades, we are not making the decision to boycott *SOVETSKAYA ROSSIA*, the newspaper. I believe that to boycott a newspaper is to assume the road of the past. Let them speak their piece, if they really want to. And let people know that a certain person has a specific point of view. Every article must find its reader, and we must come to that image which we consider democratic through a juxtaposition of opinions.

No matter how unpleasant it was to read Andreyeva's article, it did express one point of view. Let us respond. In Riga I responded to the article on the market, also in *SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA*. I expressed an entirely opposite point of view on this question. So what, should we now chop off the editors' heads?

We must act by political methods. Today we have over 4,000 different organizations for perestroika throughout the country. There are such organizations, although they are few, who even before perestroika did the same thing as they do now—express disagreement with the very principle of Soviet rule. Yet the other 4,000 are in favor of perestroika! We must work very carefully with them. We must see what load certain organizations bear, and what their common charge is.

But here is what I want to say. Why should we separate glasnost and perestroika? Let's take them together. Maybe it will come out better. Maybe we will be stronger.

As for the status of the second secretary, I will allow myself to argue a bit. I am not speaking about a specific individual now. The question of the specific individual is for the party organization to resolve. To elect one, another, a third or a fourth—that is your business. Only,

comrades, do not do it according to national indicator, so that it will not become established that Russians elect Russians. You understand. Maybe you have different specifics. I do not want to apply any cliches, but there are republics where, on the contrary—they ask. It happens in different ways. Yet, since such a formulation of the question is a principle one, and I would say an intelligent one, can it really be that this is the main thing that you and I must resolve today? When we speak of the status of the republic, responsibility, independence, of new relations, of trust? We must all discipline each other and clearly select the priorities.

[L. Shepetis] I would like to remind you of the first meeting between the Union of Writers and the movement. I came there then and said: "It is not you and us, it is us all together for perestroika". This remains in force. Of course when, as they say, a husband and wife have already created a family, there are other questions which arise for further clarification. The question of the press organ has been resolved. Only the technical aspect remains.

Chairman of the republic's Union of Theatre Actors, USSR people's artist R. Adomaytis: I would like to speak about independence. If only this principle were brought to life in all the oblasts! Today the Theatrical Union has to bother the chairman of the Council of Ministers over some trifle, a video camera.

I too have become a bureaucrat and encountered such a phenomenon as division of republics into categories. I don't know the criteria according to which such division of artist's unions is conducted. Our workers receive much lower wages than comparable workers in Moscow or in the Ukraine.

[A. N. Yakovlev] This must be changed. This category classification, in my opinion, is really one of the rudiments. The question is not even one of wages. It is also a moral question.

Vilnius Chief Architect and USSR Academy of the Arts Corresponding Member G. Baravikas said: If we speak of certain achievements and shortcomings in our life, we immediately speak also of distortions in architecture, since our profession is tied with the state of the economy and with construction on the whole. Frankly speaking, we were discouraged from contacts between science and art. We were given the role of servant to the construction industry, which in our country is probably the most inert, even though truly sacred tasks have been placed upon its shoulders. Such a huge regulatory apparatus has been created! So many prohibitions have been issued! In my 25 years of professional work I read these words most often: prohibit, reduce, deny. We cannot write on our building that we had to save such-and-such amount of cement, such-and-such amount of metal. Yet future generations will simply think that we were poor architects.

Frankly speaking, today we would be very grateful to our intelligentsia if it had hastened to our aid 10 or 15 years

ago. We, the architects, are grateful to perestroika because it has shaken up all of society. Democracy which is based on the dialogues of specialists and non-specialists will be the guarantee which perhaps will eliminate deformations.

V. Laurushas, chairman of the republic's Union of Composers board of directors, LiSSR people's artist: The first question is the propaganda of Lithuanian Soviet culture abroad. There are many people in the West who know little about the Soviet Union and Lithuania. This is very sad, because there are high achievements both in literature and in music, and they are practically unknown. Publishers and composers come to us from other countries and expose the "gaps". We have raised the question of our own union's supporting all trips abroad and all direct ties. We have specific proposals to this effect. We are ready to organize a Baltic music and Baltic countries festival. These are the Soviet Union, the GDR, Poland, Denmark, Sweden and Finland. We have some very good performers. This festival, it seems to me, would serve the cause of promoting the musical art of Soviet Lithuania and the Soviet Union, because Leningrad, Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania would all take part in it.

The second question is in regard to the anthem of Soviet Lithuania. V. Laurushas expressed the opinion that the present anthem cannot be considered satisfactory. He suggested forming a commission which would decide whether a new anthem should be created, or whether the one which was sung prior to 1950 should be used.

During the times of the Stalinist deformations of socialism, the sense of national achievement was suppressed in any manifestation and was synonymously called nationalism, said L. Yatsinyavichyus, assistant editor of the weekly publication LITERATURA IRMYANAS. The first mass deportation of the population on 14 June 1941, on the eve of the war, strongly undermined the faith of the intelligentsia in Soviet rule. Despite this fact, the German occupationists were not able to form a Lithuanian legion, and for this the foremost leaders of Lithuanian culture were again made to pay. Meanwhile, the Lithuanian division fought together with Russian soldiers on the battlefields of the Great Patriotic War. After the lesson of 14 June 1941, three-fourths of the Lithuanian writers went abroad. Nevertheless, Lithuanian culture was reborn. During the Soviet period, several generations of scientists, doctors and writers grew up and were educated in this country. Already by the early 70's Lithuanian painting and architecture, Lithuanian poetry and prose received all-union recognition, as did our vibration stand technology, laser research, heart surgery, and the work of our mathematicians. And all this was quite logical and regular.

But just when it became easier to breathe, when the possibility arose of honestly looking without fear into our history, of filling the gaps in culture, of defining the

historical ties in art, of looking into the state of our native language, just when this process was tied with the rebirth of the Soviets in the direct sense of the word, with real socialism instead of that which we read on placards, someone had to go and drag the old myth of Lithuanian nationalism out of the trunk and put it into circulation. Who needs this outdated myth? Is it to once again prove our undying watchfulness, our need to be at our posts, to distract attention from the solution of the current pressing problems?

Another myth is the dependant status of the Lithuanian people. How is it that a people who have always worked without rest suddenly turn out to be in debt? There may be different points of departure, different manipulations with figures and prices. However, there is a primary value—the attitude of man toward labor, and it is inadmissible to discredit this fact. The republic's workers have believed in perestroika, and these two myths demean them.

A. Gelbakh, assistant editor of SOVETSKAYA LITVA: I believe that Vitautas Petkyavichyus is incorrect in saying that there was not a single anti-Russian proposal. We invite the leaders of the movement to our editorial office to clarify all the contradictions. We do not want a confrontation. We want to go forth together. Another matter is that everything is so sensitive, that every word that you say to us or that we say to you is taken literally. We must avoid this.

Speaking at the conclusion of the meeting, A. N. Yakovlev said:

I must share the feeling that I am very satisfied by our conversation. Thank you. I read quite a few newspapers, journals and reports before coming here. However, when you begin to feel the actual mood of the people, the impressions here, of course, are quite different. One person can fool you. For two it is a little more difficult, for three—almost impossible. But when there are more than three, in my opinion, it is excluded. We must trust and understand each other. We all know the basics. In order to understand the point of view of another, you have to put yourself in his place and to see things through his eyes. Or, to put it another way, you have to put yourself in his situation and ask yourself the simple question: How would you act under these circumstances? Then you will get the answers. Maybe you would act more calmly, or maybe more emotionally, but all the truths are specific.

Of course, you have your share of problems, but I am convinced that many of these problems will already be solved during the coming year. Some other ones, evidently, will not be solved right away. They will be solved at the reporting-electoral party meetings and at the sessions of the USSR Supreme Soviet. One session will deal with the plan for next year, and the other with constitutional changes. These will create a legal basis for the subsequent forward movement. Then the USSR

Congress of People's Deputies may be elected at the upcoming elections and, when it meets, it will elect the Supreme Soviet, a permanently acting body. It, in turn, as we expect, will ratify the position and elect the chairman of the Supreme Soviet. The Central Committee Plenum on national matters is coming up, and finally, the reorganization of local organs of authority on the basis of the new rules which will be adopted by the Supreme Soviet. This will be in the fall of next year. You will have to formulate your own parliament and elect a chairman of the Soviet and a government. We must get through these times with dignity, comrades. They will yield us much benefit.

We must also foresee the difficulties which we will have to overcome. Aside from all the good that it will bring, and I am convinced of this, there will also be various misunderstandings and dissatisfaction with the process and individual outcomes of the elections. All this will be, because all the people will be involved in this process. We have never had this before. Everyone is talking about perestroika and the conference, but this is nevertheless occurring primarily within the party and touching upon only a portion of the non-party members. Today processes are beginning in which all the people will participate. We must not forget this factor. We will take not merely steps, but giant leaps toward the development of democracy. And, I do not think that you will object when I say that all of us are a bit lacking in democratic political culture. This will be a breakthrough in our everyday consciousness, dear comrades. It will be difficult for us to digest all of this, all in one year. Many needed decades to do this, and we want to do it in a year. Thus, as they say, for this one year we must make ourselves into a fist and accomplish one deed.

Let us sit down like this in the fall of next year and remember what we have said here today.

Thank you, comrades, good health to you, and much success.

12322

Proposed Lithuanian SSR Constitution Amendments Examined

18090002 Vilnius VAKARINES NAUJIENOS in
Lithuanian 25 Jul 88 p 2

[Interview with Academician Juras Pozela, president of the Lithuanian SSR Academy of Sciences: "Scientists Propose Amendments to the Constitution"]

[Excerpts] A commission set up by the Lithuanian SSR Academy of Sciences has completed its work on the preparation of proposals for introducing amendments to the Lithuanian SSR constitution. These proposals have been completed and sent to the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

[Pozela] During the period of restructuring and with the social revolution underway, opinions concerning strengthening the republic's sovereignty, its authority in managing the economy and culture and solving problems related to nationality are being voiced more vigorously. For example, many people raised the issue of the status of the Lithuanian language as the state language.

[Passage omitted]

In April a commission was set up headed by Academician E. Vilkas, chief secretary of the Academy of Sciences Presidium. The best known and competent members of this commission have studied and analyzed the republic's constitution, not in the sense that they didn't know it before, but in order to be able to give constructive, realistic proposals for amending it, proposals which would correspond to the tasks set by restructuring.

[Passage omitted]

Our commission has stated and verified that many articles in the Lithuanian SSR as well as the USSR Constitution deny sovereignty to the Union republic and its economic, cultural and social independence. In its conclusions the commission found it necessary to draw attention to the fact, that for many years, beginning with 1940-1941, the centralization of administration and bureaucracy increased, while the authority of the republic decreased. During the course of time, certain articles disappeared from the Lithuanian SSR Constitution, for example, articles which dealt with the republic's laws governing the setting and collection of state and local taxes and dues, the granting of citizenship of the Lithuanian SSR, the passing of laws by means of a referendum, and others.

In many cases only secondary issues were left within the jurisdiction of the republic.

Therefore, the commission maintains that one of the most important propositions that should be included in the republic's constitution is that on the territory of the Lithuanian SSR only the laws of the Lithuanian SSR should be in force.

[Passage omitted]

Our proposition is the following: The USSR can have such authority on the territory of the Lithuanian SSR as has been defined by the laws of the Lithuanian SSR, and not vice versa.

[Passage omitted]

[Question] What are some of the more important proposals concerning culture, education, nationality relations and compulsory military service?

[Pozela] We believe that republic subordination should be established for all culture, education, science, press, radio and television institutions on the territory of the republic.

We propose that the Lithuanian language be granted the status of the state language.

In the republic's laws on citizenship, citizenship of the Lithuanian SSR should be defined, granted and withdrawn by the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

It should be added here, that it has been proposed that leadership cadres should be elected and appointed from among the citizens of the republic. Citizens of the USSR, who are of a nationality other than Lithuanian, should enjoy equal rights and duties with Lithuanians. Regulation of those who come to the republic from other parts of the Soviet Union should be by a corresponding law of the Lithuanian SSR, and by taking into account the needs and material resources of the republic.

Concerning compulsory military service. It has been proposed that it be regarded as a duty of every male citizen of the USSR to defend his country against aggressors. He must carry out his military service in the republic military detachments which are subordinate to the USSR Ministry of Defense. Soldiers can be sent beyond the borders of the USSR only by decree of the Supreme Soviet and only if this does not violate the United Nations charter.

[Passage omitted].

UD/313

Former BSSR Chief Mazurov Discusses Stalin, Khrushchev, Brezhnev Regimes
18110064 Kiev MOLOD UKRAYINY in Ukrainian
3 May 88 p 1

[Interview with Kyrilo Trokhymovich Mazurov, chief of the All-Union Council of Veterans of War and Labor, by Vitaliy Portnykov, special correspondent for MOLOD UKRAYINY; date and place not specified. Article heading: "K.T. Mazurov: 'Our Goals Concern Everyone'" under the rubric "An Autograph for the Reader"]

[Text] ...This was perhaps my first May Day demonstration. I remember wearing a red tie and my holiday best white shirt. I took pride in the fact that I had been commissioned to carry a portrait of one of the leaders of the party and state. First of all, the portrait of K. T. Mazurov was given to me: here was a man with a strong-willed face, an intense look in his eyes with a furrowed chin, and the Star of Heroism pinned to his lapel. I was a tall lad and thus involuntarily drew the attention of one of the individuals responsible for organizing the parade who said that "my Mazurov," in his opinion, was suspended too far above the other portraits.

They commissioned me to carry another portrait. The man in this portrait was adorned with three little stars and shiny medals on his left side. How grown up I seemed to myself and how high I had carried the portrait as we passed the central tribunal.

After nearly 10 years, I found myself sitting in Kyrylo Trokhymovich Mazurov's office. Involuntarily I started comparing the man and his parade portrait. The photographer had done quite well in making sure that his subject was portrayed accurately: showing the confidence and at the same time the weariness. A leader's job, as we all know, does not guarantee freedom from worry, especially when you are in a position of responsibility. And K. T. Mazurov has held top positions since the time he was 26 years old. Before the war, he directed Komsomol work. Shortly thereafter, he became First Secretary of the Minsk obkom (oblast party committee) and the Minsk gorkom, chief of the BSSR Council of Ministries, First Secretary of the BSSR CP CC, and candidate for membership in the Presidium of the CPSU Central Committee. And finally, he was a member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and first deputy to the Chief of the USSR Council of Ministries. In 1978, he was relieved of his duties due to his health; however, he did not get the rest he deserved. Mazurov, who was one of the organizers of the All-Union struggle against Hitler on the home front, has written an interesting book of memoirs called "The Unforgettable" in which he talks about the partisan movement in Belorussia. At the present moment, Kyrylo Trokhymovich is director of the All-Union Organization of War Veterans and Labor.

It was not by accident that we started our conversation with the Komsomol work. In June of 1939, Kyrylo Mazurov (a former serviceman and junior political officer in the reserves) was made director at the military-athletic department of the Gomel obkom of the Belorussian Communist Youth League. Before long, he was elected First Secretary of the Gomel Gorkom and the Brestsk obkom Komsomol.

[Mazurov] The atmosphere which existed within the Komsomol organs during those years was much different from what it is today. Initiative was developed within the limits of decisions and directives implemented by the party agencies. These decisions were made in an effort to strengthen our regime: by consolidating collective farms, developing the Stakhanov movement, and directing military-athletic activity aimed at preparing the future defenders of the Fatherland. In the villages, for example, the Komsomol proved to be a major influence in that Komsomol organizations were in existence everywhere here.

The work was difficult. In the raykom Komsomol, there were only two available workers—the secretary and chief of registration. The others—secretaries, members of the

bureau and committee—were all activists. And these activists really worked hard; oh, how they worked! At present, the Komsomol has gained the right to more initiative.

[Question] The idea of "Komsomol apparatnyk"—a person who has chosen to work for the Communist Youth League as a profession, as a means and way of making it to the top—was this idea already in existence?

[Answer] This was beginning to happen for some. The desire to become an "apparatnyk," a Komsomol functionary, showed up mostly in those who didn't have a profession. Back then, the people who were respected the most were the ones who had a technical education and who understood industry. For example, I was a road technician and dreamed of working on some really big project. But working side by side with me there were already a group of hard-working young men who seriously believed that their future was somehow tied in with social-political work.

[Question] You directed Komsomol activity during some difficult years. At the time of exchanging party documents in the Belorussian CP, nearly half of all the party members were expelled. "Virtually the entire directorate of the republic, among them the Central Committee secretaries, chief of the Council of the People's Commissariat, People's Commissariat, narkom, leaders of city party and soviet organs and representatives of the creative intelligentsia were expelled from the party and a considerable number of them were arrested." I was quoting from a speech you gave at the 22nd CPSU Congress. Only recently have the facts surrounding L. Kh. Tsanava and the crimes he committed in Belorussia been revealed. He was sent over by Beria, the Minister of Internal Affairs; they used to call Tsanava the "other Lavrenti." Were Komsomol workers and young people affected by these events?

[Answer] During those years, I wasn't a Komsomol director yet. I served in the Red Army, but I remember how the youth couldn't understand why the Komsomol authoritative leaders—like Kosaryev or First Secretary of the CC BSSR Communist Youth League Auhustaytis—were proclaimed enemies of the people and all of a sudden disappeared without a trace. Each one of us was affected by this. And then court proceedings got under way. We found it hard to read the newspaper, the pages being filled with the confessions and repentance of well-known people who had been Lenin's cohorts and were leaders during the October Revolution and the first years of Soviet rule. Of course, already in the late 1920's, many of them had been criticized in the press and at various meetings, being labeled Trotskyists, Right Oppositionists, etc. For example, I had thought that these people simply held a different position from the entire party and Stalin. I was amazed: how could they have become spies?

In those years I regarded Stalin as a symbol for the will of the party, which was to lead the nation from one victory to another.

[Question] 22 May 1941. Kyrylo Mazurov abandoned the city of Brest where fascist tanks had penetrated. During the years of the Great Patriotic War, he worked in the operative group within the [Belorussian Communist Youth League] Central Committee, had been to the front, and was wounded in action. Mazurov then devoted himself to the task of fighting on the home front by serving as secretary of the Central Committee BSSR Komsomol and commissioner of the Central headquarters of the partisan movement. All these events are detailed in the book "The Unforgettable," which has been published in Minsk in two editions and just recently by the Moscow Publishing House "Molodaya Gvardiya." I asked Kyrylo Trokhymovich to recall at least one episode that describes the meeting with the kovpakivsty in the territories of partisan Belorussia.

[Answer] Yes, in January of 1943, I and R. N. Machulskyy (one of the secretaries of the Minsk underground obkom of the KP(b)B) arrived at Kovpak's headquarters, which at that time was located in the village of Chervoniy in the Zhitkovichskiy Rayon. Sydir Artemovich, who was in his 50's, of medium height, stocky, somewhat stoop-shouldered, with a small wedge-shaped beard, grey squinting eyes, in a long dark sheepskin coat and a lambskin cap worn cocked to the side just like the Zaporozhian cossacks, in fact, really did resemble one of Gogol's Zaporozhian cossacks. He was a real "Ukrainian father-figure." We were introduced to Kovpak's fighting comrades S. V. Rudnyev and P. P. Vershyhora. Commissar Semen Rudnyev was a stern rather dry man and by partisans' accounts uncompromising when it came to all sorts of "liberties," and who successfully fulfilled his command. Petro Vershyhora, deputy commander of reconnaissance, was comparatively young but looked like an old grandfather; he had a long spade-shaped beard. Though a man of few words, he was very attentive and always gave strict, precise orders. The Kovpak formation moved slowly through the forests of southern Belorussia, preparing for a raid to the west.

Before our departure, I reminded Sydir Artemovich of our first meeting. It was in September of 1941 in the city of Putivl, where he was the chairman of the city council. And I, being a representative of the army's political department, was mobilizing transport for the immediate evacuation of the front line hospital. As it turned out I had to ask the stubborn chairman for vehicles. First he got mad, but then yielded.

"I was looking at you and thinking: where in the world have I seen you? And so that's who you are!" said Kovpak. "I was really angry with you then. You had taken just about my last vehicle, which was supposed to transport weapons and rations to the partisan detachment base."

We parted laughing...

[Question] Can you be counted among the party members "called into office" in 1957? (In 1957, the CPSU Central Committee Plenum expelled the anti-party group including V. M. Molotov, L. M. Kaganovich, and G. M. Malenkov from the Central Committee and elected new members to the Presidium of the Central Party.)

[Answer] Well, yes and no. Under Stalin, I was First Secretary of the party obkom, and in 1957, I was a candidate member of the Presidium of the CPSU Central Committee and was associated with the new generation of leaders who desired change. And I thought: how are we going to handle things in the future? Stalin was gone; his former cohorts, who tried to pull us in the old direction, had been ousted. New people arrived. But a lot of things are necessary for effective leadership—experience, wisdom, and knowledge. This knowledge, however, was missing. Lenin's well-known works, among which is his "Testament," were published (but these were not all his works) only after the 20th Party Congress which convened in 1956. This also had an effect on our activities. The old methods were being employed but we were searching for...

[Question] How did things go with N. S. Khrushchev? What is your opinion of him?

[Answer] I remember Khrushchev as an energetic leader, with a lot of initiative; he was a real hard worker. As the secretary of the BSSR CP Central Committee, I received unpleasant telephone calls from him almost every week, which concerned something he might have read in the paper or heard from his assistants: namely, that something in Belorussia, so to speak, was not right. Immediately, he would pick up the receiver and start giving me a piece of his mind, as they say, calling one up "on the rug" for it. He often reprimanded me for these or other shortcomings in the economy, which we already were aware of, or for not carrying out recommendations that we thought were unacceptable.

Khrushchev was definitely a hard worker; he never allowed others to slack off. However, as I saw it, his consultants were not very competent people. They were always coming up with problems for him that really grabbed his attention. And as a person, Nikita Sergeevich was quite emotional and took everything to heart. He would often make hasty decisions on his own and then these would never be appropriate in real life. His theoretical knowledge and personal experience (Moscow and Ukraine) were just not adequate in terms of leading an entire nation. He was the type of leader who relied on personal experience and he foisted this experience on those who had an entirely different approach. Khrushchev's indefatigable energy and initiative did not always bring about positive results.

With regard to his moral character, Nikita Sergeevich, in my opinion was a disinterested person. It doesn't seem to me that anyone had the upper hand in his family. He never elicited favors or gifts (I remember I once brought him a straw box made in Belorussia for his birthday).

Whenever I talk about Khrushchev, I think about one particular folk tale. A bear is trying to make bows by bending branches in the woods. He destroys much of the woods but never is able to make any bows. Near the end of his leadership, Khrushchev realized that things were not going well for him at all. He walked around dissatisfied, cranky, but those around him continued to promote his cult and a film appeared entitled "Our Nikita Sergeevich"; journalists praised him constantly. The creative intelligentsia, which had been very supportive of the thaw that began after the 20th Party Congress, suddenly started giving themselves over to destructive criticism, especially, the younger poets. We leaders were dissatisfied with the mistake in dividing party organs between industry and farming; with the abolition of farming raykoms; with the way that corn was making its way clear up to Arkhangelsk; and the way we were forced to follow Lysenko's recommendations. Then there were the persistent demands to get rid of private cattle and private plots of land belonging to collective farmers; there was the adventuristic slogan "Overtake America" and volutarism. My comrades and I quite often argued with Khrushchev over a number of different issues at conferences and even during personal meetings. But he never paid any attention to our thoughts. All this undermined his authority. And it all ended as was to be expected.

[Question] Were relations between Ukrainian and Belorussian leaders maintained during the time you headed the BSSR CP Central Committee?

[Answer] Yes, but insufficiently. Our meetings were primarily "ritualistic," "10-day" affairs. During those years, I visited Ukraine a number of times at the request of the former First Secretary of the UKSSR CP Central Committee O. I. Kyrychenko. I remember he was an energetic and persistent person and at times perhaps too much so. I was on friendly terms with other Ukrainian leaders as well: M. V. Pidhorny, N. T. Kalchenko, D. S. Korotchenko, and I. S. Seniny.

[Question] In regard to prominent republic figures, in your opinion, what was the "secret" of the stability of the Belorussian party leadership?

[Answer] True, there really were no particular incidents. We always worked together; for example, in 1953, Beria had made an effort to replace M. S. Patolychev, a Russian who headed the BSSR CP Central Committee. But the Plenum of the BSSR CP Central Committee opposed it. The reason we defended Patolychev was not because he was an ideal leader. We just couldn't understand why they didn't consult us.

Here are the reasons for stability of Belorussia's party leadership: first, the majority of our party cadres were united during the war years in partisan detachments; secondly, the system of work with cadres in Belorussia was closest to the Leninist system. We depended on the Komsomol reserves and proceeded to train them accordingly. In their moral attitudes, Komsomol workers were impeccable people. Their salaries were low and they didn't have any special privileges accorded to them.

When I became secretary of the BSSR CP Central Committee, I drove myself around; I'd been driving since 1932. I traveled throughout the rayons and in Minsk without an escort, but the issue, you understand, is not the vehicle. Let me say a few things about Belorussia. We lived modestly and never gave quarter to anyone who tried to take money from the government for his own purposes. Even now, Belorussia has no problem with corruption or widespread theft. I don't think there ever will be.

The party leader here was never an unknown entity. Those elected were prominent figures of authority. And this authority was not on a piece of paper, but with the people. None of the prominent leaders of Belorussia are reviled today in the republic; they are all highly esteemed.

[Question] The situation with the Belorussian language is a serious problem...

[Answer] For me, the problem was indeed very complex. I was born in the region of Gomel, which prior to 1927 was part of the Russian Federation; consequently I never studied Belorussian in school. But I did learn the language later on. I have always believed that there are two native languages in Belorussia—Russian and Belorussian. Now, parents are the ones who decide which school to send their children to.

If I can be critical of myself for a moment, I really didn't pay too much attention to this issue and neither did others... It's only been recently that people have started taking an interest in the Belorussian language. The creative intelligentsia is really taking the situation to heart.

Language is one of the national manifestations, and I'd go as far as saying one of the main manifestations. As long as a particular nation continues to exist, the native language should never have to die out; moreover, language, culture, and folklore must all continue to develop. Another area of concern is the need to preserve each nation's history. During wartime, the language question, understandably, was not an important issue—the main thing was to overcome the deadly enemy. In time, the economy was revitalized. The Belorussian intelligentsia has every right to be concerned. But why didn't it become more involved earlier? When I was secretary of the BSSR CP Central Committee, the question was not

raised. I recall one particular incident. It was my appearance at a plenum of the republic's Union of Writers. I spoke Belorussian; however, it wasn't fluent, literary Belorussian. Anyway, I received this note: "Comrade Mazurov, why do you speak Belorussian if you don't know the language that well?" The answer I gave the writers there was that I had a poor command of the language because I never had the opportunity to practice. But I think that here my speech should have been completely in Belorussian. I still consider both Russian and Belorussian my native languages.

Let me say this with regard to resolving the language question. We have to approach the issue very tactfully, with the attitude that national languages deserve equal status. Everyone needs to know Russian, the language of international communications. Currently, the party seems to be focusing on the right issue: if you work in a leadership capacity in Ukraine or Latvia, for instance, please, learn the native language. You can speak Russian, but when people address you in their native language, you should answer them in that language.

[Question] Let's turn to Moscow during the 1960's. You were appointed First Deputy Chief of the USSR Council of Ministers at the time Kosygin's economic reforms were beginning.

[Answer] Reforms were taking place even during Khrushchev's time. At that time we were already convinced that reforms were definitely needed. I'm speaking for all the members of the Politburo. O. M. Kosygin was an experienced person and an authoritative leader of the national economy. He had previously occupied ministerial posts; he had been deputy and First Deputy of the Council of Ministers. But this reform wasn't just his, it was a collective reform.

The reforms could have been implemented sooner and would have been more effective if it hadn't been for Khrushchev's voluntaristic proposals. He liquidated virtually all of the ministries. Exercising poor judgment, he went ahead and formed disfranchised state committees that would take the place of the ministries. As is known, industry in our country is set up by placing two or three related businesses in all republics, rayons and oblasts. Khrushchev, on the other hand, placed industry under the authority of Obkom Councils of National Economy, which proved to be detrimental to industry. And our first task was to summon up all the resources we could to try to rebuild the planned economy. After that, we suggested reforms that would give more rights to local organs and enterprises themselves, as well as simplify the managerial structure. There were lots of interesting things planned, but our measures came to naught. And it wasn't because of any subjective factor; we simply were discussing the idea of reform within an ossified administrative command system of government. So the reforms failed to give us any positive results because we kept the old system. We should have immediately incorporated democratic methods into the administrative system. We

didn't do this. The administrative command system was against any kind of change. The idea of reform began to subside; people started forgetting about it. And when L. I. Brezhnev stopped, for all intents and purposes, involving himself in matters, practically everyone calmed down. There was a real difference between Khrushchev and Brezhnev. As I said before, Nikita Sergeevich "hassled" republic party leaders almost every week, whereas Brezhnev only called them to wish them a Happy Birthday or to request an increase in grain supplies. Not only did he work very little, but he also quenched initiative in others.

[Question] By his own example?

[Answer] Not entirely. For instance, after the October 1964 Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, we got together and agreed that the members of the Politburo should spend most of their time in localities meeting people and trying to resolve essential issues. In the first few years, this was the way it worked, but later on Leonid Illich probably felt threatened because during these trips we would express our own thoughts independently of the Central Committee, of course, these opinions did not conflict with the general party platform, but all the same the General Secretary was not too pleased with this. He started insisting that the Politburo should decide who would go where and what one could say or couldn't say. He traveled a good deal himself, talked with a lot of different people, but demanded very little of these localities. He did not allow others to do this. Of course, these were not the main reasons which led up to the phenomenon of stagnation. We need to examine the whole situation much more thoroughly.

[Question] At the present time, a new textbook of the party's history is being prepared, but as before, there's not enough information available. What do we know, for example, about the fate of your colleagues in the Politburo during the 60's and 70's—H. I. Voronov, D. S. Polyanskiy, O. M. Shelepin, P. Yu. Shelest, and others? Is there any way we might become acquainted with their views of that period? Perhaps we should publish a special biographical reference book devoted to party and state leaders?

[Answer] You've mentioned the names of my old comrades. Not all of them left their jobs because of personal desire. I hope that these facts and others will appear in the new textbook. In regard to the reference books you can blame me for their absence. I was not a proponent of revealing everything about everyone.

[Question] I'm not suggesting this. In my opinion, our knowledge of our present and former leaders should not just come from the portraits of them carried in parades.

[Answer] Maybe we should establish this tradition. But I'm out of my depth here. I recall a certain incident. In the West, there's a publishing house that publishes, among other things, an annual "Who's Who Almanac."

Every year, since the time I started working in Moscow, a representative of this publishing firm would call on me (as well as on other members in top positions) with the question: 'What's happened with you guys this past year?' I told my assistants that I would not see him. Despite this, a lot of detailed information about me has been printed in this book. It probably contains quite a bit of gossip, along with out-and-out lies. When we don't provide journalists with official information, they can fill in the empty space with their own fabrications.

[Question] Can we acquiesce to the tradition of having leaders disappear from public view and not utilizing their experience or counsel once they leave their posts? Maybe you're the only person who's decided to stay active in the public-political life upon retiring.

[Answer] I'm far from being the only one. There are actually quite a few leaders who continue working after they retire. But possibly among the former members of the CP Politburo I am the only one. I'm hoping that the 19th Party Conference will change all that, because it's not wise to do without the veterans. Scientists and prominent cultural figures continue working even after their retirement. And as for administrators, are they simply manager-specialists? They have a unique opportunity to analyze their own experience and shortcomings as well as other people's mistakes. Perhaps we don't need to have their advice when it comes to building the future. But, what we don't need to do is to repeat our mistakes and this is where their experience is indispensable. This is quite an important matter.

[Question] Let's look at the image of the party worker today. Can we consider it normal that the public sometimes believes its leaders to be people who are motivated by careerist considerations and who profit by some sort of special privileges, etc? Do such "minutiae" obscure what is really significant?

[Answer] I find it hard to talk about contemporary leaders, because I've not worked within the party apparatus for the last 10 years, which means that a lot of changes may have taken place. I do know that after the war years so that party workers would not have to seek material assistance on the side, leadership cadres (not just party cadres), were granted some benefits: an increase in wages, permission to order food products in definite quantities, and polyclinics were created for them. This was all implemented when no one was enjoying any kind of privileges; instead, everyone worked day and night. This system was operating during all the post war years. In principle, I think this was right. Not too many people have the slightest idea what a leader's work and life are like. In fact, an honest person in a leadership position essentially does not have a personal life. Some successes, good results, and pleasant events serve as a kind of medicine—for a short time at least they elicit a feeling of well-being. But stress prevails by and large. Let me give you a personal example. When I worked in the Council of Ministers, a day didn't go by

without my having experienced something unpleasant; after all, the country is so vast. All information regarding the country is immediately relayed to the Council of Ministers, and whether it was night, day, a day off, or a regular week-day I had to make decisions. This applies to my colleagues as well. I never went to bed without taking sleeping pills. I used to bring home stacks of urgent paperwork. There would be telephone calls in the middle of the night: there's a fire at an enterprise, there's been a transportation accident...an earthquake...have you notified the minister? What's he doing? Notify so and so, send an airplane... How can one sleep after all this?

The incentive in this line of work is not material gain. The incentive is your sense of responsibility, your duty, your authority, if you will.

[Question] In reading editorial mail, one notes that many of the letters are written by people of the older generation and that a considerable number distinguish themselves by their rigid ways of thinking and downright conservatism. What part should the organization of veterans plan in this case? We talk a lot about educating young people—and this is good. Now isn't it time we said something about the necessity of exerting influence on members of the older generation so that this issue doesn't come to a head?

[Answer] That's a good observation. There certainly are people in our midst with conservative views. But the younger generation needs to understand one thing, this conservatism is not just some kind of "senile grumbling" but has a completely different origin. Let's consider: when the party committed itself to a policy of democratization and glasnost, much of the younger generation started blaming the entire older generation for mistakes and not the individuals responsible. It upsets me, too, when they say that the past was a time of "barracks socialism." Yes, I'd have to say that there were elements of "state socialism," but the people weren't the ones to blame. They worked honestly and did what they were supposed to do. If they hadn't of been, it would not have been possible for criticism to appear in the press.

We have to be very tactful whenever we approach the older generation. We mustn't offend them. They worked harder than they were physically capable of working and they were the ones who fought. They underwent Stalin's repressions and rebuilt the economy. For a long time we've known that we need restructuring as much as we need air to breathe.

[Question] What do you think of today's economic reforms?

[Answer] They're quite interesting. I particularly enjoyed Gorbachev's recent speech on cooperation. This is all very good, but if our ideologists don't concern themselves with restructuring the psychology of people, everything could come to a grinding halt again. Remember, we also gave impressive speeches and called people to

action. Words alone do not mean much if people do not go through psychological restructuring. If the restructuring of thought does not occur, it'll just be that more difficult. We can't really live this way any longer. And we can't just play at restructuring.

There are all kinds of people. Some only think of themselves. Right now, we're going after the bureaucrats, that is, those workers within the administrative apparatus; however, not all administrators are bureaucrats. We can't implicate everyone across the board. There are those opposed to restructuring in other levels of society as well.

The truth is that we all need to restructure ourselves. I mean everyone. This includes young people who should not cast off the value in the legacy the older generation has left to them. But if someone of the younger generation prefers to think that we of the older generation have not made any contribution for a better future, well then I find this to be very tragic. What we must do is support unity of ideas and creative endeavors and safeguard the legacy of generations. This is why the All-Union Organization of Veterans of War and Labor, along with the Komsomol, if conducting educational work among youth. Regardless of what is being said, we possess a wealth of experience, we've become strengthened in undergoing the class struggle, and we've created unique material and spiritual values which serve as a base for the further development of socialism.

However, socialism is not a fixed form but a revolutionary movement toward complete social justice and the harmonious spiritual development of all workers. The party's course of restructuring is directed at achieving these goals.

I3006/9604

Khatlon Party Obkom Holds First Plenum

18300035 Dushanbe KOMMUNIST TADZHIKISTANA
in Russian 18 Sep 88 p 1

[TadzhikTA report: "Party Obkom Plenum"]

[Text] Kurgan-Tyube, 17 September. The first plenum of the Khatlon Party Obkom took place; organizational questions were discussed. Former first secretary of the Kuybyshev party raykom I. Khalimov was elected as First Secretary of the Khatlon party obkom. Former second secretary of the Kurgan-Tyube party obkom V. Nikolayev was elected as Second Secretary. Other obkom secretaries elected were: M. Baratov, former deputy chief of the Tajik CP CC's department of Agriculture and Food Industry; Sh. Usmanova, former chief of the Kulyab party obkom propaganda and agitation department; and S. Khayrulloev, former first secretary of the Soviet party raykom.

First Secretary of the TaSSR CP CC, K. M. Makhkamov, took part in the plenum.

TaSSR CP CC Second Secretary P. K. Luchinskiy also took part in the work of the plenum, as did Yu. Ye. Sukhov, chief of the TaSSR CP CC organizational party work department.

UD/364

Historian Afanasyev Addresses Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact in Estonia

Pact, Secession Rights Discussed
18000662a Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA in
Russian 25 Aug 88 p 3

[Interview with Yuri Afanasyev, under rubric "Point of View: "Historical Method, Dialectics, and Tolerance"]

[Text] On 23 August a meeting between the city's ideological aktiv and historians and sociologists, which had been organized by the party's Tallinn Gorkom and the Initiating Center of the People's Front, was held in the House of Political Education. The guests of the people of Tallinn included Yuri Afanasyev, rector of the Moscow Institute of Historical Archives, doctor of historical sciences, and delegate to the 19th Party Conference. He answered numerous questions from the audience. Today we offer for your attention an abbreviated transcript of that meeting.

[Interviewee] During the two days of my stay in Estonia I was convinced that life here is saturated, intensive, and full of events. As compared with other regions that I have visited recently, it is distinguished by an increased rate of sociopolitical participation. The new social movements are gaining momentum in your republic. They are developing their programs and concepts. Those documents are being published. Yesterday I attended a large political meeting in Pyarnu. From 1800 hours to 2400 hours the people discussed with a large amount of serious interest various questions pertaining to history, as well as today's critical problems. This is a good sign: our society is beginning to live a political life that is naturally inherent to mankind. But this, I must say, is not the easiest way to life.

Yesterday and today also convinced me that the questions of history are currently taking on special importance for you. Currently it will be necessary for everyone to analyze for himself what happened half a century ago and to make a clear-cut determination of his own position. Without this self-determination it is impossible to be enrolled naturally in the sociopolitical life of today's Estonia.

The questions that will have to be clarified are actually not simple ones. And the crux of the matter is not only in the "unexplored areas" of history. They can still be eliminated. In my opinion, the crux of the matter is that our history has proven to be essentially falsified.

But I would not want to force you to listen to me. You probably have questions you want to ask... A dialogue is more in keeping with the spirit of the time.

[Question] Are you acquainted with the draft version of the NF [People's Front] program, and, if so, what is your opinion about it? Have you read Arumyaev's article about the Ribbentrop-Molotov pact and do you agree with all its

provisions? What purpose, in your opinion, is pursued by the People's Front in organizing the discussion by mass audiences of this complicated question, which has not yet been completely worked out at the competent levels?

[Answer] I became acquainted with the NF program while I was still in Moscow. It is a serious document. At the 19th Party Conference I listened to the statement made by your first secretary, and it seems to me that many of the provisions in the platform presented by your party delegation and in the NF program are largely in agreement. Can this document be considered to be perfect? No. It needs additional work. It has to be refined and deepened. But on the whole my attitude toward it is positive. I repeat, it is in consonance with the goals of perestroika. The document is replete with specific features that are local and purely Estonian, but this is natural.

I have read Arumyaev's article. With regard to many statements in it, it does not cause any objections. There are, however, a few things that I might argue about. For example, the positive evaluation of the pact itself. It might have been possible to make a more definite statement about the compact between Stalin and Hitler, about the deal that settled the fates of nations. The article mentions the ethical aspect of the pact, but that should be discussed in a stricter, more definite manner.

And now to discuss what goals the People's Front is pursuing. If we are speaking in general, then it wants to promote the perestroika. It is striving to have the republic change over to cost accountability, it is concerned about the upsurge in national culture, and, in a word, it wants a better life for the inhabitants of the republic. What relationship does the discussion of the pact have with this? During the past two days I have senses that the situation in the republic is not a simple one. The party of national independence—I think that that is what it called—has announced itself, and there are definite tensions between the People's Front and the International Movement that is in its inception stage. A person whose views are apparently close to those of the party of national independence spoke in Pyarnu... Judging from discussions with people, many questions are understood variously by the Estonian and Russian population. Therefore it is necessary to weigh things as carefully as possible, and to guarantee the maximum caution and depth in analyzing every principle. I am a historian. And from the historical point of view it seems to me that the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact decided the fate of Estonia. It was followed, essentially speaking, by occupation. Many people have become accustomed to the idea that, in 1940, the Baltic republics experienced both a revolutionary situation and a socialist revolution. But today it is unpromising to treat in this manner the events that occurred. It is necessary to talk about historic injustice under conditions of historical irreversibility. Historically, geopolitically, and economically, Estonia is integrated with the Soviet Union. Failing to take this into consideration means taking the path of political

adventurism. Therefore the program of the party of national independence, starting with its first paragraph of having Estonia secede from the USSR, seems to me to be a perfect example of irresponsibility. Yes, the USSR Constitution has established firmly the right of the sovereign republics to self-determination, up to and including secession. Theoretically also, the existence of socialist Estonia outside the USSR is admissible, and hearing that should not cause anyone to fall into a faint. But, practically speaking, persistence concerning this is political irresponsibility and adventurism, which can lead only to tragedy. It is not simply desirable to speak about historic injustice, but, rather, it is vitally necessary. But for what purpose? In order to restore historical truth or to speculate with it and with the nation's pain? But these questions must not be ignored. If we recognize the injustice that was perpetrated on the nations of the Baltic republics during the period of Stalinism, if we assert that it does not make sense today to speak seriously about a socialist revolution here during what was actually occupation, then, once again, nothing will collapse. Because we must keep looking ahead. And everyone, including Estonia, can move ahead only on the basis of the consolidation of all the forces that have a self-interest in this.

[Question] Do you feel that, in principle, there exists the possibility that any republic can secede from the Union?

[Answer] Insofar as we have included in our Constitution the right of every nation to self-determination up to and including secession, then, theoretically, I repeat, this must be allowed. But in my opinion, the main thing today is to achieve a situation in which every republic is truly sovereign. That is, to return to the Leninist plans of national and state policy, because it was precisely for this that Lenin fought during the last months and days of his life. But the dying Lenin lost this fight to Stalin. And what was implemented was a fundamentally different basis for uniting the union republic. They were transformed essentially into oblasts or territories of a single centralized state. But sovereignty cannot be nothing else but the right of every republic to have complete control of its land, its mineral resources, its water resources, and the results of its labor. A republic enters freely into whatever treaty relations it wants, with whoever it wants. And that is what we should strive for. This pertains also to republic-level cost accountability, to which, of course, we must strive. This is what has been stated in the decisions of the 19th Party Conference. And all the efforts of the party and economic aktiv, and of any inhabitant, must be directed at this. But, once again, with one proviso: neither Estonia nor any other republic should become an island of cost accounting in Soviet Union without cost accountability. This will sound paradoxical, but, in my opinion, the resolution of Estonian problems today lies outside the confines of Estonia. You will have to begin living with a consideration of nationwide interests if you want your own matters to benefit.

[Question] Can the People's Front serve as a guarantee against the rebirth of Stalinism?

[Answer] Yes. We need social movements, since they form a democratic society and improve the political culture of the masses. What do you have in your republic that is good? The fact that the deeply underlying segments of the population, and all categories of the population, have been included in sociopolitical life. If you succeed in uniting all these forces in order to resolve the vitally important tasks that they have in common, that will be a major guarantee.

[Question] But how can we stabilize the situation in the republic? Maybe you ought to ask your associates in Moscow for their advice!

[Answer] (After the laughter in the auditorium has subsided.) What do you mean by "stabilize?" Bring the situation to a static condition, that is, to the point of immobility? It would probably be more correct to speak, if such a necessity exists, about normalization. Because you cannot slap down or ban the existing social movements... People think, they test things, they search, they want something better. And it is not precluded that they also make mistakes. But on the whole, this is what progress is. I take the most serious view of the national question. I think that it is one of the most critical problems confronting the Union as a whole. And I repeat once again: the time has come to restructure the USSR on the basis of the principles of Lenin, who saw the country's future as "a single Union of republics of Europe and Asia," as a federation of independent socialist republics. Today it is necessary to eliminate the ironing down, the leveling, the averaging of the republics, their unification. This is complicated. But this will inevitably have to be done. When a symptom of disease appears in an ethnic group—and that has occurred among us—it is necessary to study the deeply underlying foundations of that disease. And they lie in social and political reasons, and began to accumulate long before 1917. Currently, during the period of glasnost, all these unresolved social, political, economic, and cultural questions, complexities, and sore spots manifest themselves frequently as national ones. People must know and remember this.

[Question] Are there any living witnesses (either on the Soviet or the German side) to the concluding of the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact?

[Answer] Yes, of course.

[Question] What is the opinion of the people at the higher official levels concerning the publication in Russian of the secret minutes pertaining to the pact?

[Answer] The official point of view will be expressed by the people at the higher official levels. As for the APN roundtable discussion, I would not enter into any unscientific disputes about the authenticity of the text. Modern historical science is completely capable of differentiating between a genuine text and a falsification. An example of this is provided by "Hitler's diaries," which were published in the West and which were exposed literally two weeks later.

[Question] What is your attitude toward one party's having a monopoly? Wouldn't it be better for the CPSU if other parties existed alongside of it?

[Answer] All monopolies are bad. And party monopoly is no exception. But... We have socialist countries with a multiparty system. There also used to be different parties in Soviet Russia. And it seems to me that our intellectual efforts should be channeled today somewhat differently. Let's think a bit about this: by what means can we transform our only party into the truly guiding one? There have appeared among us all the opportunities for expanding the pluralism of all types even under a single-party system. If our society becomes truly democratic, if all the social movement begin to develop freely in it, then it is not precluded that the time will come when the question will arise concerning the creation of other parties, which, naturally, promote the development of socialism. I do not see anything tragic in this. If one follows the spirit of the 27th Congress, then one party and its guiding role is no longer an axiom, but a theorem that requires constant and convincing proofs by deed.

[Question] Should Estonia be afraid today of Russification and assimilation if it has avoided this during the centuries of its difficult fate under constant foreign influence?

[Answer] Of course it should. And one must not allow that to happen. On the contrary, it is necessary to restore what has been lost. An upsurge, or, if you will, a renaissance of Estonian culture, incidentally, will never contradict the interests of the people of other nationalities who are living on this land—if one can find here the necessary tact, the necessary moderation, and the optimal interrelationships. Incidentally, tsarism was a rather solid regime that never hit upon the idea of using economic methods of assimilation.

[Question] If, let us assume, the People's Front conducts a referendum and 70 percent of the population is in favor of seceding from the USSR, will it be democratic to keep the republic as part of the country?

[Answer] But what if 49 percent are in favor of secession, and 51 percent are against? Are we really to believe that questions like this can be resolved arithmetically? This is an over-simplified method of dealing with such serious problems. And, I repeat, Estonia has been integrated into the country's economy. Its secession would affect the interests of the entire population. The problem here is much deeper.

[Question] As a human being and as a scientist, would you have to reconsider your positions?

[Answer] Of course. I wrote my candidate's dissertation in 1969, and from my positions today I would admit that it is scientifically unfounded. I defended my doctoral dissertation in 1980, and today I ready to subject certain things in it to criticism, but it has not lost its scientific

significance. My political position has also changed, especially after the 20th Congress, because during my years as a student I also had a strong tendency toward dogmatism, as did many others. The process of perestroika is also exerting its effect constantly, and this is natural and ought to occur with every normal person.

[Question] Several times you have emphasized the right of the indigenous nationality to feel that they are the owners of the land...

[Answer] Of course. That's natural!

[Question] ...But 40 percent of the people living in Estonia are of nonindigenous nationality. And they have been making a rather considerable contribution to the national budget. What about their rights?

[Answer] Obviously, no one denies the opportunity for, say, a Russian to live on this land, to work for its welfare, or, consequently, to feel that he has as many rights as anyone else. But we must not forget that this is still Estonian land, and it must remain Estonian land in perpetuity. Because there is not just a bond of housing and territory, but, rather, a bond and roots that are deeper and more substantial than simply a person's place of residence. There can be no completely valid Estonian culture on any other territory. I have heard that Estonians are being insulted and that certain Russians do not want to study Estonian. I think that people ought not to insult one another, but that we should create real interrelationships with which the study of a language becomes a necessity. There must be a deep inner respect for this land, and then, I think, a Russian who has been inculcated with these feelings will naturally fit into the local life...

[Question] Are you a member of the CPSU, and what did you write in your membership application?

[Answer] I entered the party in the 1960's, with the hope of being useful to the party and to people. How many of those hopes were justified and what hopes will still have to be fought for are a matter of conscience for every Communist Party member.

EDITOR'S NOTE. Certain questions touched upon in the course of the discussion remain outside the confines of this transcript. The editorial office has at its disposal Yu. N. Afanasyev's fundamental article, which is being prepared for publication.

Meetings Mark Pact Anniversary

18000662b Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA in Russian 25 Aug 88 p 3

[Article by P. Myaelo, ETA: "History Cannot Be Reversed"]

[Text] On 23 August a number of measures marking the 49th anniversary of the signing of the nonaggression pact between the USSR and Germany were conducted in our republic.

Comparing what occurred that day with what happened a year ago, one can see especially clearly what a tremendous path the republic has traveled in the development of democratization and glasnost as a result of the perestroika that was begun by the party and supported by the nation. I shall be so bold as to assert that not a single one of the measures that occurred on 23 August 1988 would have been conceivable in August 1987 either with regard to their scope or with regard to their approaches.

Without a doubt, a measure that became the most important event of the day was the political meeting with the title "Stalinist Policy and Estonia," which was organized in Tallinn by the People's Front. Long before that meeting began, both tremendous auditoriums of the city hall were completely filled. On orders from fire-safety workers, access to them was closed. But thousands of persons who gathered in the square in front of the building also became participants of the meeting with scientists—everything that occurred in the auditoriums was relayed by powerful loudspeakers.

Without a doubt, this interest was evoked not only by the immediacy of the topic, but also by the fact that the participants in the meeting included a famous Soviet scientist whose published works in the central press had repeatedly drawn the attention of the Soviet public—Professor Yu. Afanasyev, rector of the Moscow Institute of Historical Archives.

Participants at the meeting expressed their decisive disagreement with the positive evaluations of the pact. In the opinion of the scientists who participated in the meeting, the 1939 pact was a deal arranged between Stalin and Hitler, a deal of which the nations of Eastern Europe became the victims.

Yu. Afanasyev emphasized that he considers the doubts concerning the authenticity of the pact and the appendix to it which were published in the West and also recently in our republic's press are unfounded. The division of spheres of influence between the two powers and everything that followed after it was yet another crime of Stalinism.

At the same time it was mentioned at the meeting that history cannot be reversed. And attempts to turn it back 49 years are fruitless. Theoretically it is possible to discuss the independence of socialist Estonia outside the confines of the USSR, but the only people who can promote those slogans are those who are suffering from political blindness. A person with common sense cannot fail to see or fail to take into consideration the real-life political situation and the degree to which Estonia is economically, politically, and ideologically integrated into the Soviet Union.

After giving a high evaluation to the rate of social participation in our republic and after mentioning its vanguard positions in the struggle for perestroika in the country, Yu. Afanasyev said that, in his opinion, the

decision of many problems in Estonia lies outside the confines of the republic. In particular, this pertains to the problem of republic-level cost accountability, inasmuch as it is impossible for one region to have relations of cost accountability with others in which cost accountability does not exist. Therefore, it is in the interests of the Estonian nation, as well as those of all the other nations in the country, to fight to assure that the entire economy of the Soviet state is put on a healthy basis.

Yu. Afanasyev and the Estonian scientists who participated in the meeting—M. Titma, E. Savisaar, and others—replied to the hail of questions that came crashing down on them. Many of them pertained to the Soviet-German pact and its consequences for Estonia. Others pertained to our republic's current situation. There was a discussion of the problems of national relations, the restoration of historic justice, economic development, etc.

The meeting participants adopted a statement in which it requested the republic government: to express its attitude to the so-called Ribbentrop-Molotov pact and its consequences for Estonia; to send to the FRG a group of qualified scientists to study and evaluate the documents pertaining to the pact; to form a competent commission which would be capable of providing an objective evaluation of the pact; to create a single system of archives and provide all specialists free access to the archive materials; to conduct the reinstruction of history teachers and introduce the appropriate radical changes in the curricula; to publish in Estonian and Russian the collection "Stalinizm i Estoniya" [Stalinism and Estonia]; and also to request B. Saul, Chairman of the ESSR Council of Ministers, to give a report in exactly one year concerning the fulfillment of these recommendations.

A similar meeting, differing only by its smaller scope, occurred on 23 August in the House of Political Education, of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Estonia.

Between these two meetings, a rally that had been organized by various spontaneous groupings occurred in Khirve Park in Tallinn. The rally began with the laying of flowers on the Linda sculpture. More than 2000 persons attended the rally.

The members of the "MRP-AEG" group who spoke at the rally, as well as the members of an organization that called itself the Estonian Party of National Independence, stated that it was precisely their actions a year ago that had awakened the Estonian nation from its political slumber, and it was precisely they who had become the leaders of perestroika. There were some things that those speakers could be accused of, but it was difficult to accuse them of being modest. It cannot be said that only demagogic fabrications were expressed there: the speakers also stated much that was practical. Mention was made of the serious problems in the development of

historical science, the difficult state of the Soviet economy, including our republic's economy, and that, as part of the USSR, Estonia will be able to live a full life only under conditions of true sovereignty, including economic.

Unfortunately, there was no shortage, however, of statements of the type that, at the meeting in the city hall, the scientists had called irresponsible ones. Certain statements, especially those addressed to the non-Estonian population, were—as sad as it is to say this—simply insulting and completely ignored the real situation in our republic.

In Tartu a rally on Town Hall Square was organized by the Estonian Society for the Protection of Monuments of Antiquity. Here too, over a period of two hours, there was a discussion of the evaluation of the pact that had been concluded 49 years ago, and the problems of Estonia's sovereignty and independence. In many statements one could hear genuine pain concerning the tragic fate of the Estonian nation during the years of Stalinism, demands to restore historic justice, and mentions of the alarming ecological situation. But, here too, members of the "MRP-AEG" group and the so-called Estonian Party of National Independence issued appeals to turn back the wheel of history.

A rally also occurred in Vyru. The persons who spoke censured the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact and the appendix to it, sharply criticized Stalin's foreign and domestic policy, demanded the publicizing of the names of those who had carried out mass repressions in Estonia, demanded freedom of information, and mentioned the problems of Estonia's economic and political sovereignty.

It was not until late at night that the meeting in the Tallinn city hall ended. Problems that are too serious were discussed on 23 August 1988 and too little time has passed to enable anyone to give a profound interpretation of everything that was said, to separate in one's consciousness the wheat from the chaff, and to formulate definitively one's attitude to what had happened. What we saw and heard on that day provide us journalists—and not only us—with rich food for reflection and analysis.

5075

Crimes of Stalin, Henchmen in Azerbaijan Revealed

18310432 Baku KOMMUNIST in Azeri 11 Jun 88 p 2

[Article by Mammad Katibli, cand. hist. sci.: "The Crimes of the '30s"]

[Text] "...We can and must never excuse the events of 1937 and 1938; we cannot and must not justify them. Never. Because those at the head of state at that time were responsible."

M. S. Gorbachev

It was 1937. Every day incomprehensible events took place, and terrible news was being spread. A heavy sorrow hung like a stone from men's hearts. They refrained from meeting, even greeting one another; they tried not to meet one another's eye, and to remain alone. There was not one day when someone's relative, friend or acquaintance was not exposed as an "enemy of the people." Doubt, fear and conjecture prevailed. Every day newspapers revealed secret "counterrevolutionary," "terrorist," "saboteur," "Trotskyite," "pan-turkist," and "panislamic" organizations in institutions and administrations, centers of science and learning, cities, and villages, or wrote about "enemies of the people."

At this time the 13th congress of the AzC(b)P was convened. Its "goal" was to expose even more "enemies of the people." Mir Jalal Baghyrov, first secretary of the CC AzC(b)P (he held this position 1933-1953), who gave the accounting report, said at the end of his speech: "To excuse someone under such conditions means to betray our party's Central Committee and Comrade Stalin. No one can be pardoned. The facts of recent days show once again that we have still not exposed all enemies of the people. I will repeat once again that they are fighting against us, they are unmistakably fighting."

During the congress USSR Procurator A. Y. Vyshinskiy wrote in ZARYA VOSTOKA: "We must fulfill Stalin's directive on exposing daily and regularly enemies of the people, provocateurs, and saboteurs."

These words, uttered at the same time, complemented one another. L. P. Beriia, M. J. Baghyrov, Y. D. Sumbatov-Topuridze (AzSSR Commissar of Internal Affairs) and R. A. Markaryan (AzSSR deputy Commissar of Internal Affairs), who were Stalin's faithful comrades-in-arms, were not satisfied with only words; they worked heart and soul to fulfill the directives of the "great leader"—they tried to find even more "enemies of the people," they threw people into prison, sent them into exile, sentenced them to death: they exceeded the "plan." At the congress Baghyrov angrily protested the release of 2,500 people from one prison and called all of them political prisoners. Imagine this: if this many prisoners were in one prison, how many prisoners were in the republic as a whole? You see, how could a republic with countless political prisoners be victorious on the frontlines of socialism?! But they were not satisfied with this; they slandered communists at every step, even at bureau meetings; they expelled them from the party as "enemy elements" indiscriminately. At a bureau meeting of the AzC(b)P on 5 November 1937 alone the expulsion of 279 individuals from the party was mechanically confirmed.

Stalin constantly violated Lenin's work style and the principles of socialism in 1937-1938, which are considered the black years in the life of our country. He replaced collective thought with absolute rule, democracy with personal dictatorship.

Let us return to the past and cast a glance at the road by which we reached 1937. In the winter of 1929-1930 the collectivization of agriculture and liquidation of the kulaks as a class was begun. During the spring planting campaign the collectivization of millions of farms throughout the country was implemented by means of unlimited organizational measures. When kolkhozes were organized, the number of kulaks "increased" and they were deprived of voting rights. Mass punitive measures led to uprisings against the kolkhoz and the government.

In PRAVDA on 3 April 1930 Stalin wrote in an article "Answer to Kolkhoz Comrades": "The kulak is the enemy of Soviet government. There is no peace between us and them and can never be. Our policy on the kulaks is a policy of liquidating them as a class." He issued a call to drive the kulaks (the majority of whom were simple rural workers branded by the term kulak - M.K.) from the villages and destroy them as an entity. As a result of this directive, in Azerbaijan tens of thousands of villagers were arrested as "kulaks" and shot. In this same period (1929-1930) the mercilessness of M. Baghyrov, who was chairman of the Azerbaijan Extraordinary Commission, manifested itself especially clearly. The prominent revolutionary Asad Garayev (who also became a victim of the cult of personality) said in his speech at the 9th congress of the AzC(b)P in 1929: "We are calling two animals harnessed together a kulak, seizing one animal and making it responsible. But how do we cultivate the land in the village without the two animals harnessed together? Under these circumstances how can one develop the village or agriculture?"

In a letter sent to the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist(b) Party by Bukharin, A. I. Rykov, and N. I. Tomskiy in January 1929, they sharply criticized the military-feudal policy of exploitation directed against the village; in the mistakes of this policy they saw a transition to food rationing in the 12th year of Soviet rule, the semi-starved situation in a number of rayons, and serious shortages of raw materials and industrial goods. M. Baghyrov said at the 12th congress of the AzC(b)P even in January 1934: "Did not Bukharin accept the wailing of a kulak as a cry for help of a village?" In examining his speech at this congress one gets the idea that Azerbaijan was full of right and left deviationists, mutineers and nationalists. He said: "We have still not rooted out the enemy. Recently the speech of a Trotskyite at the Azerbaijan Industrial Academy came to light. Speeches of class enemies at the Azerbaijan Agriculture Institute were heard; enemy elements are active in peoples commissariats, schools and institutes, and an atmosphere of nationalism prevails among certain strata of the intelligentsia."

The torturers of the people attacked along the entire front to liquidate the "atmosphere of nationalism." If we look at some party documents from 1933, we see that in

that year 68 raykom secretaries, 88 organization department directors, 77 mass propaganda directors, 54 rayispolkom chairmen and 37 newspaper editors were removed from jobs due to political charges. At two institutes alone—the Azerbaijan Pedagogical Institute and the Social Economic Institute—eight directors, one after the other, were severely punished "for loss of political vigilance." Or another example: in 1934, 266 out of 540 communists in Aghdash Rayon were expelled from the party and arrested; and 340 kolkhozniks were shot as "kulak-antisoviet elements."

Forward-looking sons of Azerbaijan saw the harm that the mistakes and violence were doing to the community. Jamil Vazirov (one of the victims of the cult of personality), who was the republic's Commissar of Agriculture, said at the 12th congress of the AzC(b)P: "Some comrades talk about various kinds of sabotage in agriculture. But it is incorrect to always connect mistakes in the work to sabotage." J. Vazirov proposed a number of interesting ideas for the development of agriculture, especially about increasing attention given to soil in Absheron.

The peculiar situations we confronted on the road to 1937 did not end with these. Along with the "rapid increase in the number of enemies of the people, Trotskyites, saboteurs, various kinds of deviationists, panturkists, and panislamists" and the unjust, primitive measures taken against them, the attack on historical-cultural monuments was not "forgotten." A beautiful mosque at Bibiheybat, magnificent minarets some hundreds of years old in Shaki and Mashtagha were destroyed. The Alexandre church near the Saadet Saray was demolished. Countless valuable books and sources providing information on our history, culture and literature were destroyed. If a book written in the Arabic script was found in anyone's home, they called him a molla or panturkist-panislamist and arrested him.

The celebration of Novruz was forbidden to the population. But in the first year of Soviet government all Muslim workers and officials were freed from work in connection with the holiday on 21-22 March according to a directive from Nariman Narimanov, chairman of the AzSSR Soviet of Peoples Commissars and decree No 17 issued by the republic Labor Commissariat and the republic Trade Unions Council and published in KOMMUNIST of 21 March 1921. Later, however, Novruz was branded as "counterrevolutionary." In 1930 newspapers wrote that Novruz conveyed a counterrevolutionary character and that a broad struggle had to be conducted against it.

In 1934 the All-Union C(b)P held its 17th congress. Many of Lenin's comrades-in-arms and prominent servants of our party and people were later shot as "enemies of the people" by means of false accusations. The "victors" of that congress called it the congress of those who were about to be shot. The congress took place under conditions of limitless praise for Stalin and his "servants."

From A. I. Mikoyan's speech: "The last 10 years without Lenin showed the road. Stalin is defending the unity of our party even better than in earlier years and has led it in its battles successfully." It is interesting that A. Mikoyan set a personal "record" important for the time—he mentioned Stalin's name 30 times.

"It would be difficult to show any congresses in the past which had greater Bolshevik unity than the present one"—these are the words of K. Y. Voroshilov. As has been seen, even V. I. Lenin was often forgotten.

On 19 August 1936 L. Beria, first secretary of the Transcaucasian Oblast Committee of the All-Union C(b)P, reported on the exposure of a number of counter-revolutionaries and Trotskyite-Zinovievites in the Transcaucasus—in Tbilisi, Yerevan, Baku, Leninakan, Batumi, and Kirovabad—in his major article in PRAVDA, "We must root out enemies of socialism."

Essentially, this article was a call to make a mass judgment on prominent party, state, science, and culture personalities in the Caucasus. And this came to pass. As in the rest of the country, a cruel struggle against "enemies of the people" in the Transcaucasus was begun. As the first signal, an open court started operating in Moscow on the same day in order to pass "judgment on the Trotskyite-Zinovievite terrorist center." The military college of the supreme court passed judgment on a large group for "organizing an attempt on Stalin and his comrades-in-arms."

In order to further the building of socialism Stalin's claim that the class struggle was intensifying, which ran counter to the roots of Marxism-Leninism, formed the theoretical basis for the groundless accusations and liquidation of hundreds of thousands of innocent people in the country.

In order to imagine the people's tragedy it suffices to look at the articles printed every day in the republic's newspapers in 1937 alone. Reading them, one reaches the conclusion that there was not one institution, administration, school, kolkhoz, etc. in Azerbaijan in which "enemies of the people" were not active.

In May 1937 the 12th Baku party conference was held. M. J. Baghyrov began to openly slander servants of party and state from these conferences' tribunal. He accused S. M. Afandiyev, H. Sultanov, M. Israfilbeyov (Gadirli), M. Pleshakov, I. Dovlatov, H. Aghaverdiyev, and others of "actions unbefitting partyism and bourgeois nationalism." Above all, at his behest, on these same days a party meeting was held at the AzSSR Central Ispolkom in order to prove that S. M. Afandiyev was "connected to bourgeois nationalists." The meeting lasted 4 days, but M. J. Baghyrov was unable to obtain his goal.

Every means was used to physically destroy prominent sons of the people of Azerbaijan who had given of their strength for a Soviet government on the road of revolution, and slander was hurled at them. The tribunal of the 13th congress of the AzC(b)P, which convened in June 1937, was also used for the same goal. This congress was the last at which Azerbaijani revolutionaries from Lenin's old guard and prominent state and party servants were gathered together. M. J. Baghyrov said: "A number of organizers of counterrevolutionary work in Azerbaijan and Baku, Japanese-German and Trotskyite-Musavat agents were exposed. These bandits have penetrated our party and have held responsible positions for a long time in the apparatus of the Central Committee and the Baku Committee." He continues by saying that Afandiyev, Hamid Sultanov, Gadirli, and others took all kinds of nationalists, musavatists, panturkists, panislamists, and other counterrevolutionary elements under their wing and committed sabotage against the party, the Soviet government and the people of Azerbaijan.

At the congress the following dialog took place between M. J. Baghyrov and S. M. Afandiyev.

M. J. Baghyrov: Afandiyev, I know that you sent a complaint to Moscow. To prove it I can tell you who carried it, the train, and the number of the ticket! Afandiyev, wishing to deceive us, was trained under Lenin's leadership. But in an article written in 1924 dedicated to Hummat on the 25th anniversary of the Baku party organization he did not say one word that he was the disciple of Comrade Stalin, the founder and organizer of the Baku Bolshevik organization.

S. M. Afandiyev: Certainly I sent a petition to Moscow. I knew that you would try to expose me as a counterrevolutionary. But this is impossible because I am not a counterrevolutionary.

M. J. Baghyrov: Afandiyev, we are not allowing you to die in your own manner. We will dispose of you and pass judgment in our own time!

M. J. Baghyrov then said in an attack on Hamid Sultanov: "Comrade, Hamid Sultanov does not lag behind Afandiyev. At this point we would say that he also sent a petition to Moscow. You are a counterrevolutionary but do not wish to be recognized as such. You are trying to cheat the party congress from this sacred, high tribunal."

He also did not "forget" the servants of science and culture at the congress: "Take a look at who has been sitting in the Writers Union. Huseyn Javid, Ahmad Javad, Mikayyl Mushfig, Ali Nazim, Boyukagha Talybly, Taghy Shahbazi, Ahmad Triniy, and other scoundrels who have been exposed! Using the influence of that merciless enemy of the people Ruhulla Akhundov, they have put the Writers Union in terrible condition."

Persecution was elevated to the level of state policy. The "physical pressure method" was applied everywhere. Following the 13th congress of the AzC(b)P the mass imprisonments of prominent party, state, science, and culture figures in our republic began. Before going to prison, S. M. Afandiyev sent a letter to Moscow, to Stalin and Kalinin. He had known Stalin when he was in Baku in 1907. Later, he had worked together with him as deputy chairman of the Central Bureau of Communist Organizations of Peoples of the East under the CC RC(b)P in Moscow and in other responsible positions. From 1931 to 1937, when he was chairman of the AzSSR TsIK, one of the secretaries of the TsIK ZSFSR and even a deputy chairman of the USSR TsIK, he was in close contact with Kalinin. Like the others, he believed in Stalin's justice. S. M. Afandiyev's wife Zivar Khanym (now a private pensioner) recalls that he went to Moscow and reached those to whom the letters had been sent. He discussed the situation with N. Krupskaya, who had known S. M. Afandiyev since he had worked in Moscow in 1919. While N. Krupskaya did go to Stalin about the matter, there was no result.

The petitions remained unanswered...As for M. Baghyrov, he continued his bloody activity. He even took pleasure in them. In his words: "When I left my job at the Azerbaijan Extraordinary Commission in 1927 and went to work at the Transcaucasian Water Resources Administration, Mammadamin Rasulzade (leader of the Musavat Party abroad - M.K.) began to talk about 'my victims.' Without wasting a minute, he wrote in the pages of his journal YENI KAVKAZ that 'they made Baghyrov, the torturer of the Azerbaijani people, head of water resources; perhaps the waters of the rivers of the Caucasus will help him when he washes his hands, which are stained with the blood of the sons of Azerbaijan...'"

Such conditions of terror were also special to the life of neighboring republics. In the middle of 1937 the 10th congress of the communist organizations of Georgia and Armenia were held. At these congresses convened under the leadership of L. Beria, famous revolutionaries, party and state, science and culture servants, and soldiers were accused of "counterrevolutionary and conspiratorial actions" and were arrested. On 5 June he wrote in the PRAVDA article "Results of the 10th Congress of Bolsheviks of Georgia": "The Trotskyite, espionage-sabotage-conspiracy center to which B. Mdivani, M. Torosheidze, M. Okujava, S. Kaftlaradze, N. Niknadze, and others belonged was exposed."

Three days later an article called "Ruses of the Enemy" signed by Rykin appeared in PRAVDA. It is stated in the article: "The Trotskyite and Musavatist Ruhulla Akhundov has done whatever he wanted on the cultural front without supervision. He was head of the Azerbaijan affiliate of the Academy of Sciences, led the committee on the fine arts and was chief of the Writers Union. He stacked these organizations and administrations with his own people, with secret and open enemies." Slanders are also heaped on our young poets Samad Vurgun and

Suleyman Rustam in the article. (At this point we would note that M. J. Baghyrov at the 19th Congress of the AzC(b)P in 1952 (the last one in which he would take part) interrupted Samad Vurgun and said: "You should learn the alphabet of communism quickly or be destroyed." At this same congress he also addressed insults to Mirza Ibrahimov, Said Rustamov, Shamsi Badalbeyli, and other prominent cultural figures. Somewhat before the congress, in 1950, he "passed judgment" on the prominent Soviet scholar and philosopher Heydar Huseynov and caused his death).

By order of M. J. Baghyrov republic newspapers constantly published articles on the "counterrevolutionary" work of prominent Azeri scientists and cultural figures. Through his personal directive meetings were held at commissariats, administrations, and institutions. A representative from a higher organization would provide them with information on the "counterrevolutionary" work of "enemies of the people." One of these meetings was held on 16-17 June 1937 at the AzSSR Commissariat of Peoples Education. Here, the representative from above gave information claiming that Dadash Bunyadzade, Ruhulla Akhundov, Mustafa Guliyev, Mammad Juvarlinski, and other "enemies of the people" had been filling the ranks of Azeri teachers for years with anti-soviet, bourgeois-nationalist, Musavat and Dashnak elements.

At this meeting the counterrevolutionary actions of S. M. Afandiyev, H. Sultanov, M. Hajyyev and others, and "transgressor-enemy" actions in the higher and secondary school system by the prominent scientists of Azerbaijan and its first professors B. Hasanbeyov, B. Chobanzade, Tikhomirov, V. Khulufli, M. Gadirli, A. Ubeydulin, and other scholars were discussed, and they were labeled "hard-core counterrevolutionaries." Such meetings were also held at the Azerbaijan State University, the V. I. Lenin Azerbaijan Pedagogical Institute, the Institute of Agriculture and other places.

In order to succeed in eliminating prominent personalities, "counterrevolutionary groups" were often exposed in various administrations and institutions and in centers of science and culture; they tried to make people believe in the existence of a center which controlled them. They quickly pointed a finger at the Azerbaijan State Drama Theater and unearthed counterrevolutionaries and bourgeois nationalists. Mirzagha Aliyev, Ulvi Rajab, Fatma Gadir, Shamsi Badalbeyli, Mohsun San'an, and Said Rustamov were accused of conducting long-term counterrevolutionary work at the theater. In certain places "counterrevolutionary organizations which had been exposed" were tied to a center which controlled them. Every kind of provocation and slander was attempted, false information was collected, and they "laid the foundations" to prove that S. M. Afandiyev, H. Sultanov, D. Bunyadzade, R. Akhundov, and others had provided the leadership for this center. The determination of the torturers to liquidate prominent persons who had led the revolutionary movement during the years of

fiery struggle, who had led in party and Soviet work during the years of building socialism, and who had gained deep respect and influence among the people was not strong enough to do it by surprise.

The process of "exposing the enemy" took on an ever larger scope due to the "bands of saboteurs" who were constantly being revealed. On 26 October 1937 the "judging of counterrevolutionary, mutineer, spy-terrorist, sabotage, bourgeois-nationalist organizations" began. A group of innocent people (most of whom were simple working people - M.K.) headed by Hamid Sultanov were tried for making an attempt on M. J. Baghyrov and for counterrevolutionary activity. We read in the court materials: "A counterrevolutionary, nationalist center consisting of Hamid Sultanov, Ruhulla Akhundov, S. M. Afandiyev, D. Bunyadzade, Huseyn Rahmanov, Heydar Vazirov, Gazanfar Musabeyov, A. N. Garayev, T. Shahbazi, and others took on as its duty the destruction of the Soviet government, detaching Azerbaijan from the USSR, and restoring capitalist property relations by means of preparing an armed rebellion in Azerbaijan, sabotaging agriculture, espionage, and applying terror against the leaders of party and government." Through this kind of accusation prominent children of the party and people were liquidated and a severe blow was dealt to the people of Azerbaijan.

At the same time similar trials were organized in Georgia and Armenia. Amatuni, first secretary of the CC ArC(b)P, S. Akopov, second secretary, A. Guloyan, chairman of the ArSSR Soviet of Peoples Commissars, S. Martikyan, chairman of the ArSSR TsIK, Gumedin, Commissar of Land and other leading workers were liquidated as "enemies of the people." In his own office L. Beria killed the devoted Leninist A. Khanjyan who had been first secretary of the CC ArC(b)P before Amatuni. In Georgia similar arbitrary actions also took place. Sh. Eliava, S. Kasyan, A. Lezhova, S. Ter-Gabrielian, S. Teodoriya, A. Nazaretyan, and other prominent servants of party and state also fell victim to Beria's arbitrariness. This "style" of punishment, essentially trampling on human rights and the humanitarian laws of socialism, was special to M. J. Baghyrov. He shot N. Rizayev, who had been AzSSR Peoples Commissar of Internal Affairs, in his own office. With the exception of S. M. Kirov, the first secretaries of the CC AzC(b)P from 1920-1933 up to M. J. Baghyrov G. N. Kaminski, A. H. Garayev and V. I. Polonski, the chairmen of the Azerbaijan Soviet of Peoples Commissars

(with the exception of N. Narimanov) G. Musabeyov, D. Bunyadzade, and H. Rahmanov, the chairmen of the AzSSR TsIK M. Hajyev and S. M. Afandiyev were all victims of the cult of personality. Those who worked in other parts of the country such as L. Mirzoyan, first secretary of the Kazakhstan Obkom, and M. D. Huseynov, first secretary of the CC Tajikistan C(b)P, as well as Chingiz Ildyrym, who was the first Peoples Commissar of the Military Fleet and a legendary hero and construction chief at Magnitogorsk, the heads of the Azneft Organization A. Serebrovski and M. Barinov, and others were also liquidated. In 1937 29,000 in Azerbaijan, 40,000 in Uzbekistan and countless other innocent people in Georgia, Armenia, and other republics had either been shot as enemies of the people or sent to Siberia. As for L. Beria, M. J. Baghyrov, N. Yezhov, and A. Vyshinskiy, they received Lenin medals for showing "selfless labor" in meeting Stalin's quotas (liquidating prominent sons of the people).

On 23 December 1937 M. J. Baghyrov said: "We have not yet rooted out the enemy everywhere, from every nook and cranny."

Revolutionary forces, people faithful to the ideals of socialism—not "enemies"—were removed from party and state positions—not "nooks and crannies"—and judgment was passed on them. By the end of December 1937 200 leading workers and 19 sea captains were arrested at the Caspian Sea Shipping Administration alone. Innocent kolkhozniks from Kurdmashy in Ismayly Rayon were taken to prison en masse; on New Year's Eve, 31 December, 63 of them were shot.

Decades separate us from the tragedy of the '30s. Today, it has become possible for us to speak objectively about these events. Now our party's goal is to make the humanitarian and democratic principles of socialism eternally strong, to never allow a violation of our sacred laws of life. As was stated in the theses of the CC CPSU for the 19th All-Union party conference, "as a result of restructuring, the political system of Soviet society must eliminate everything connected with the results of the cult of personality, autocratic administrative methods, bureaucratism, the distancing of workers from the government and the setting aside of Lenin's norms for party and state life."

09676/09599

Officer On Need for Contemporary Approach to Atheistic Education

18000058 Moscow AGITATOR ARMII I FLOTA in Russian No 15, Aug 88 p 18

[Article by Major A. Brusenskiy, Battalion Deputy Commander, Political Section, Kiev Military District: "Wherein Lies Our Weakness," under the rubric: "On Anti-Religious Themes"]

[Text] Not long ago I, along with battalion personnel, happened to be at a lecture given by a member of the oblast's Znaniye Society. The lecturer was introduced to the audience as "an expert on the atheistic education of youth." We anticipated a spirited and convincing discussion on the Millennium of the Acceptance of Christianity in Rus but instead of a substantive and convincing debate, we heard phrases like "a maelstrom of reactions," "counter-revolutionary force," "Hitlerite priests," "Hitlerite gangsters," and the like.

I decided to write to you about this, since as a propagandist I very strongly feel that in the present day and age our young audience does not accept on faith worn out phrases, antiquated notions and even more so, epithets instead of hard evidence. Indeed, the subject chosen by the lecturer is a little too sensitive to be tackled in such a cavalier manner. It must be understood that the atheistic education of youth these days cannot be conducted by the methods of the 20's and 30's, when "bulldozers simply plowed through churches"; when everything was denied, and nothing was proven nor clarified. The 1,000-year anniversary of the Russian Orthodox Church cannot be wiped out in one stroke. This requires a deep understanding; people must be informed about the positive role that the Russian Orthodox Church played in our history and wherein its real reactionary quality lies.

Let's remember V.I. Lenin's teachings on how to conduct atheistic education. He counseled: "Religious prejudices must be combatted in an extremely cautious manner; those who offend religious sensibilities in the process of this struggle cause much harm. We must fight by employing propaganda and education." He also counseled: "We must fight religion. This is the basic tenet of all materialism and, subsequently, Marxism. But Marxism is not materialism that stops at this tenet. Marxism goes further. It says that one must know how to fight against religion; consequently, the origin of faith and religion in the masses must be explained materialistically." And this is how: explain and demonstrate but do not negate and insult.

Therein, I believe, lies the weakness of our anti-religious propaganda. Listening to the oblast "lecturer-specialist," who is also a research assistant at a local museum of history and economy, I thought about how easy it would

be to refute his claims. Moreover, this could be done not only by a clergyman nor simply a believer, but by practically each and every one of our soldiers having a high school education.

I am sincerely convinced that the time has come for alternate appraisal and approaches to this important part of the ideological struggle. Perestroyka must be applied to ideological work much more quickly than to the other spheres of our life. And a serious and deep knowledge (this goes foremost for our Armenian propagandists) is necessary for this to occur. This is the first order of business. The second is that it is necessary to drop the monologues and to boldly engage in dialogue; to be able to conduct honest and candid discussions with one's audience. Only then will the necessity pass of inviting doubtful lecturers to speak.

COPYRIGHT: "Agitator armii i flota," 1988.

Renovation of Monastery Reported

18000044 [Editorial Report] Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 25 September 1988 carries on page 3 a 200-word article by PRAVDA correspondent M. Atamanenko on the opening to visitors of the Svenskiy Monastery complex. Located on a section of steep shoreline on the Desna River, the monastery is a 700-year old structure famous as a place visited by Peter the Great. It had fallen into a state of disrepair some time ago, and the first stage of its renovation work was just completed.

New Church Built for Believers in Stavropol Oblast

18000045 [Editorial Report] Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian on 11 October 1988 carries on page 2 a 300-word article by V. Zaykin and V. Larionov about the construction of a new church to replace one that had fallen into ruin in the western section of Zheleznovodsk. The Stavropolsk Bakinsk eparchy has contracted with the Mineralovodsk Consumer Service Repair-Construction Administration (which works on a cost accounting basis) to do the work.

The authors of the article state: "It is only now that we realize that for believers Orthodox churches, Roman Catholic churches, mosques and synagogues are vital spiritual necessities."

The church's senior priest Father Georgiy claims that the original church had been built at the beginning of the century and had come to require costly and time consuming repairs yearly, so the eparchy decided to raze the old church and build a new one in its place. Construction will take place with contributions from the parishoners of the entire Stavropolsk Bakinsk eparchy which includes Azerbaijan, Dagestan, Northern Ossetia and Chechen Ingush. The request was timed to coincide with the celebration of the Millennium.

Work on the church is progressing on schedule. A few local parishoners who are specialists and worked on restoration of the Danilov Monastery in Moscow will paint the walls of the church. The church should be open for believers by the end of autumn. V. Tsyplakov, chairman of the

Zheleznovodsk gorispolkom, explained that following the submission of architects' plans for the new church (the idea was to have the new church conform to the city's existing architectural scheme), the church's priests were invited to the gorispolkom to review the plans.

Frunze Hosts 5th All-Union Turkic Culture Conference

18300040 [Editorial Report] Frunze SOVETSKAYA KIRGIZIYA in Russian on 8 September 1988 carries on p 1 a 900-word KirTAG report entitled "Turkic Culture: Sources and Contemporaneity" on the 7 September opening of the 5th All-Union Turkic Culture Conference in Frunze. Participants included representatives of scholarly institutes in Moscow, Leningrad, the union and autonomous republics. R. I. Otunbayeva, deputy chairperson of the Kirghiz SSR Council of Ministers, opened the conference. Speeches were also heard from Kirghiz SSR Academy of Sciences president N. P. Laverov, Kirghiz People's Writer Ch. Aytmatov, and Chairman of the Soviet Turkologists Committee, E. R. Tenishev.

UD/364

First Ukrainian Language Holiday Celebrated

18110005 [Editorial Report] Kiev RADYANSKA UKRAYINA in Ukrainian on 23 September 1988 carries on page 3 a 400-word article on a 4-day republic holiday celebrating the Ukrainian language. This was the first holiday of its sort to be celebrated in the republic. Festivities were held in the Kirovograd area. According

to UkSSR Deputy Minister of Education I.S. Khomenko, the celebration turned out as successfully as it did because of joint organizational effort on the part of party, soviet and Komsomol workers, as well as representatives from the educational, cultural and literary spheres. From now on this holiday will be held yearly in Kiev, Lvov and other places.

Khomenko goes on to state that the ministry has given its approval to the introduction of Ukrainian language classes into kindergartens. Also, teachers of literature will be given leeway for more creative independence in their work. A Ukrainian language and literature course has been introduced at institutes of higher education, and classes at pedagogical institutes will now be held in Ukrainian. Khomenko says that the ministry is depending on help from writers, critics and linguists in writing textbooks and essays on the Ukrainian classics to be used in literary study groups and in teaching gifted students. Additionally, the ministry is really counting on the press, TV and radio to assist in the language effort.

D.V. Pavlychko, a secretary in the Ukrainian Writer's Union administration, feels that the celebration gave a boost to efforts to raise the prestige of the Ukrainian language.

Kiev's Proposed Dry Law Set Aside For Time Being

18000025 [Editorial Report] Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian on 16 September 1988 carries on page 3 a 200-word report by N. Baklanov, IZVESTIYA correspondent, in follow-up to an article which appeared in the paper on 8 September 1988. The original article indicated that starting in 1989, smoking and drinking was to be made illegal in Kiev. The second article quotes G. Menzheres, deputy chairman of the Kiev gorispolkom, who reports that the executive committee of the city council and the city trade union have determined that, at least for the time being, the resolution is premature.

Baklanov goes on to say that this does not mean the resolution is rescinded. It has simply been put aside for a more propitious time ("the next prohibition campaign").

Baklanov ends by stating that "the idea of a 'dry law' in Kiev is an example of inappropriate administrative zeal

applied to the resolution of the most important social problems."

US-Soviet Cooperation on AIDS Research Progressing

18300034 [Editorial Report] Tbilisi ZARYA VOSTOKA in Russian 28 July 1988 carries on page 3 a 300-word item on a scientific exchange underway between U.S. scientists and Soviet specialists in AIDS research from the Sukhumi Institute for Experimental Pathology and Therapy of the USSR Academy of Sciences, located in Georgia. Deputy Director of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Robert Windom recently headed a delegation of U.S. specialists to the Georgian SSR. During the visit it was agreed upon that M. Volodin from the Sukhumi Institute will come to the U.S. this fall to participate in research on the virus with his American counterparts. Windom spoke favorably about the long and continuing scientific exchange between Soviet and U.S. experts in the field.

UD/363

KGB Boss Discusses Rise of Espionage Activities in Leningrad

18000654a Leningrad *LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA*
in Russian 20 Aug 88 p 3

[Article by V.M. Prilukov, delegate of the 19th Party Conference and chief of the USSR KGB Directorate for Leningrad Oblast: "Under the Conditions of Glasnost"]

[Text] [Editorial Introduction] The decree of the July Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee on practical work in carrying out the decisions of the 19th All-Union Party Conference has set out a range of specific measures aimed at strengthening the underpinnings of the Soviet socialist legal state.

At present, sharing his thoughts on the role of the state security bodies in the legal support for restructuring and the defense of its revolutionary transformations is the delegate of the 19th Party Conference and the Chief of the USSR KGB Directorate for Leningrad Oblast, V.M. Prilukov. [End of Editorial Introduction]

Probably, Leningraders have never shown such vital interest in the work of the state security bodies. At meetings of our co-workers in the labor collectives and during their talks with city residents, more and more frequently questions have been raised on what tasks are presently being carried out by the KGB bodies, what actions are they focusing on combating, how do they view their place under the conditions of the changes occurring in the nation, and how profoundly has restructuring permeated the daily activity of the Chekists.

These questions and the desire of the Leningraders to better know about the work of the law-protecting bodies reflect, in my view, one of the victories of broadening glasnost as the Soviet people have shown a natural need to have as complete information as possible about the functioning of all the bodies in the state where they live and work.

The party conference and the report of the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, M.S. Gorbachev, voiced support for the efforts of the state security bodies to improve their activities under the conditions of the current stage in the development of our society and under the conditions of the furthering of democratic processes. Just what are the specific features of restructuring within the Chekist bodies? What has dictated the necessity of incorporating substantial corrections in their work?

The conclusions and decisions of the 19th All-Union Party Conference and the July Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee have become the main political guidelines for all the Soviet people, as these have set out the ways for deepening the changes occurring in the country. Here for the Chekists of crucial significance is

the urgent challenge of the party of guaranteeing the irreversibility of restructuring and ensuring the advance of society on the Leninist principles of socialism.

In terms of the path followed and in terms of the historic scope of the changes occurring, restructuring is a revolution. And any revolution, cautioned V.I. Lenin, "is only worth something when it is able to defend itself." This idea at present has in no way lost its pertinence as the inveterate opponents of socialism see the success of restructuring as precisely a threat to their interests and for this reason do not intend to lay down their arms.

At present, one frequently encounters oversimplified views of the changes occurring on the international scene. Thus, the positive shifts in Soviet-American relations are perceived by many as almost a recognition of the complete elimination of mutual contradictions. However, actual reality is much more complicated. The "image of the enemy" which has been fostered for decades in the West will not be eradicated by any talks or decrees in a single hour.

Regardless of the occurring move-away in the world from confrontation and the strengthening of trends toward collaboration, the militant imperialist circles are not ceding their positions and are focusing their efforts on reducing the effectiveness of the foreign political initiatives of the Soviet Union and undermining the processes of restructuring in our country. It is no accident that the main target of the forces confronting us now is precisely the process of improving Soviet society in being aimed at creating an economically strong and democratic socialist state. Our opponents are in no way interested in such an historic turn of events or in the increased international prestige of the USSR.

This can be seen from the substantial recent increase in the activeness of the Western intelligence and other special services. Precisely, in recent years the KGB bodies have unmasked, including in Leningrad, a whole series of enemy spies, and some of them have gained access to important state secrets. Foreign intelligence agents were also caught red-handed abusing their diplomatic immunity for espionage purposes.

Leningrad, which has always been a constant target of intelligence and subversive aspirations, is presently attracting close attention from foreign intelligence agents and the ideological and anti-Soviet centers which are endeavoring to make maximum use for their own purposes of such a new factor as the rapid development of our commercial-economic, scientific, cultural and other ties with foreign countries.

I can say that the Leningrad Chekists have recently thwarted a number of attempts by individual foreigners to ferret out our defense and other secrets and gain information about fundamental research in the scientific and technical area. Facts have also been disclosed of intentionally causing direct material harm to the Soviet

side including by delivering poor quality, obsolete equipment and failing to supply important elements of it. Unfortunately, in our work we have also encountered actions by individual Leningraders involving the giving away of important national economic information comprising official, including business, secrets to foreign special services and firms.

Nor have the Leningrad Chekists overlooked the economic, political and moral harm to our nation by such still surviving negative phenomena as the shadow economy, corruption, smuggling and other private property failings. Probably the first herald of the irreversibility of restructuring is the rapid process of the democratizing of social life in our country. Overseas millions of persons have seen a real indication of the positive changes occurring in the USSR in the rapid growth of the social activeness of Soviet citizens. But in the West there have also been other "well-wishers" who have decided that glasnost in the Soviet Union should develop according to foreign formulas prepared in the anti-Soviet centers. In the last 2 years alone in Leningrad we have uncovered more than 500 emissaries of such organizations and they by their "directions" have urged an abandoning of the socialist principles of restructuring, and have called for actions against the strategic concepts elaborated by the party, and for anarchy and extremism. The subversive literature is of the same nature and year after year tens of thousands of copies of this are confiscated by the customs services from foreigners arriving in Leningrad.

One cannot help but notice the fact that the sense and content of such formulas from abroad are at times mirrored in the activities of individual Leningraders who, in taking cover behind the slogans of restructuring, assume a stance which is essentially alien to our system. Incidentally, there has been a discussion of such cases on the pages of the Leningrad newspapers.

We must not allow, and this was emphasized at the 19th Party Conference, that glasnost be turned against the interests of the Soviet state. We, the Chekists, in turn, see our task in protecting society against dangerous attacks of extremism from whatever side and promptly identifying antisocialist elements hostile to the goals of restructuring.

Of course, this task places particular responsibility on the co-workers of the KGB bodies. They must have the ability to correctly distinguish political confusion from conscious criminal activity. This is why we are paying increased attention to indoctrinating the Chekists in a spirit of the strictest observance of the Soviet laws and ensuring dependable guarantees for the constitutional rights and liberties of the Soviet citizens.

Undoubtedly, the establishing of social justice in our society will be greatly strengthened by those specific measures which were outlined by the 19th All-Union Party Conference and the July Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee and provide for the establishing of a

truly legal state and the carrying out of a reform of the court and legal system for this purpose. It must not be forgotten that precisely the "lack of legal protection" in the political system served as one of the important reasons for those difficult, tragic events in our history which we presently speak painfully of.

During the years of Stalinism, the NKVD bodies, the leadership of which had been taken over by political adventurers became a weapon of repression and arbitrariness and this had been preceded by a mass "purge" in the security bodies themselves. Many thousands of experienced and honest Chekists were repressed, including those who had experienced the entire burden of fighting the counterrevolution during the years of the Civil War and also in the postwar period.

After the 20th CPSU Congress, there was extensive rehabilitation of the falsely condemned, however this process was not completed. At present, in accord with the decision of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee, a commission is at work which will review new as well as already known facts and documents involving the repression. The KGB bodies are also taking an active part in this work. For the Chekists the re-establishing of truth about the victims of illegality is a political and moral duty.

I am often asked whether there is any guarantee that the tragic pages of our history might not repeat themselves, albeit on a much smaller scale? At present, it can be boldly said that there is such a guarantee! As for the state security bodies there is constant supervision and leadership over their activities by the party and it is upon party initiative that the process of the revolutionary renewal of our society, as supported by all the people, has been carried out. The party has in a principled and bold manner raised the question of its own improvement and giving up functions not inherent to it. It has set among the chief priorities the establishing of a legal state in which the most important value is the Soviet man and respect for his individuality is the superior criterion of legality, humanism and social justice.

Certainly a guarantee against the recidivists of the past is the already taken steps in the policy of democracy and glasnost which has unleashed the rich intellectual and spiritual potential of the Soviet people and has opened up zones at one time prohibited for criticism.

For the KGB bodies directly, the broadening of glasnost is, in essence, a rebirth of one of the most important traditions which was established from the first days of the existence of the VChK. At that time, precisely glasnost and the ties of the Chekists with the masses of people contributed to the prevention of many state crimes.

Obviously, not all aspects of Chekist work can be brought up for extensive discussion. The specific activities of the KGB bodies involved with the necessity of

countering the enemy who resorts to various secret subterfuges dictates the unconditional observance of secrecy in terms of the specific aims, forms and methods of work. However, without an open dialogue with the workers and without a link with the people, the security of whom we must protect, this work would lose its meaning. For precisely this reason, the KGB Directorate provides the mass information media with various materials on the results of its work. Lenizdat periodically puts out artistic and documentary materials on the activities of the Leningrad Chekists.

Each year our directorate receives from the city residents hundreds of letters and requests which to one degree or another touch upon questions relating to ensuring state security. Many Leningraders personally have come to our offices on Chaykovskiy Street, where both experienced operations workers as well as representatives of the directorate leadership talk with them. We always show an attentive attitude to such appeals and endeavor to quickly take the necessary measures, particularly if it is a question of investigating concerns about manifestations of extremism or nationalism when our actions can prevent emergencies or the leaking of secret information as well as generally on all problems related to the possible causing of political, economic and moral damage to the interests of the state and society.

Incidentally, in the course of working with requests from the citizens, we have seen that the Leningraders were still not sufficiently informed of the main areas of our activity. We still receive many letters on questions which are not the competence of the KGB bodies such as instances of abuses committed at enterprises, the embezzlement of socialist property or even requests to help in settling labor disputes. In truth, recently the number of such appeals has begun to decline. Here, obviously, we are beginning to feel the fact that glasnost in a more decisive manner has presently touched the work of the Chekists as well and that at present the mass information media have taken up this question more frequently.

The state security bodies cannot carry out the tasks confronting them without the support and aid of the broadest masses of workers. The necessity of further broadening this "feedback" in our work is becoming more apparent than ever before. Precisely glasnost helps to save the persons who have strayed and prevent them from following the criminal path, precisely glasnost is our main associate in the fight for each Soviet person, for his active position in life and for his fate.

10272

Lithuanian SSR Afghanistan Casualties Noted

18090001 [Editorial Report] Vilnius TIESA in Lithuanian 6 August 1988 on page 4 carried an 800-word interview with the chief of the Lithuanian SSR Military Commissariat Political Department, Konstantin Golubev, entitled "Soldiers From Afghanistan Are Returning

Home." In the interview Golubev remarks that in the republic news of the soldiers' return from Afghanistan was met with undisguised joy. "Those of us who work at the military commissariat saw as no others did the anxiety of parents for their sons who were called up for military service." When asked to respond on the number of young men from Lithuania who had undergone the school of severe experience in Afghanistan and what their fate was, Golubev answered: "More than 2000 participated in battles against the enemies of the present Afghanistan government and returned home; more than 300 of them returned honored with state awards, medals and orders of the USSR. Families experienced with great pain the loss of 81 of their sons, 91 were wounded and 36 became invalids. 'Afghaners' reside in almost every republic town and rayon. Their fates are different. From the first day, most of them plunged into public life, where they pass on their experience to others who will have to join the ranks of the military. In the republic, 22 of the returnees have gone to the military reserves, in which former soldiers internationalists are playing a dominant role."

The rest of the interview dealt with the problems of adjusting to life back in the rayons and kolkhozes, and, for the most part, the issue of benefits for the veterans and the difficulty of obtaining housing. When the interviewer stated that parents and relatives are worried as to whether those called up for military service will have to serve in Afghanistan, Golubev answered: "As you know the withdrawal of Soviet forces from the republic of Afghanistan is taking place. The withdrawal should be completed by 1989."

UD/313

Racism Motif in Latvian Environmental Movement

18300041 [Editorial Report] Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian on 5 October 1988 carries on p 1 a 550-word letter and response entitled "What's the Activist with the Megaphone Shouting About?" The letter, from L. Paskal, a driver from Donetsk, tells of a Latvian environmentalist rally he attended while on a business trip to Riga. One of the speakers at the rally referred to a group of seamstresses of unspecified ethnic background working in a factory in nearby Ogre as "slant-eyed monkeys." Paskal, who is apparently of a similar ethnic origin, was offended by the speaker's language (the first such abuse he had heard "in his 50 years") which he called "not just a notorious example of nationalism but a kind of bestial racism." He asks in his letter if there is not an article in the Latvian legal code providing for the punishment of those who publicly insult someone's ethnic origins. The answer to Paskal's letter comes from SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA's special correspondent in Riga V. Proskura. Proskura, who also attended the rally, says the offending speaker was E. Yansons, a staff worker in the

welfare administration of the Riga City executive committee. Proskura notes with regret that Paskal's account is not exaggerated, nor is the incident unprecedented. Yansons' remark drew applause from a group of dishevelled youths. "Perhaps," observes Proskura, "some of them belonged to the group whom the Latvian SSR Internal Affairs Minister B. Shteynbrik spoke of at a press conference. Calling themselves environmental protectionists, they put on gas masks and created a scandal by offending citizens with insulting slogans." Latvian procurator Yanis Eduardovich Dzenitis says there is indeed "a clause in the Soviet Latvian legal code providing for punishment of those who instigate nationalistic discord...the incident is being investigated."

UD/364

'Crisis' Ecological Situation in Baku Discussed
18300007a Baku BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY in Russian
4 Aug 88 p 3

[Article by O. Zeynalov: Look Truth in the Eye, or the Ecological Situation in Baku"]

[Text] The chief state sanitary inspector of the city of Baku, Yu. Uzeynov, passed away in February of this year. His colleagues told me: He did not take care of his heart; he tormented himself in a vain struggle with those who contaminated the air and sea with industrial wastes and defied the environmental protection laws and statutes. Understandably, this was just conjecture, but, unfortunately, was not far from the truth. In the numerous documents which the chief sanitary inspector signed and sent to executive authorities, one can trace well the conflict nature of his relations with directors of enterprises, departments and organizations. The documents also contained what had reduced to nothing the official duty being carried out by him and what had deprived his work of meaning—the immobilizing indifference on the part of those who had authority but did not use it.

However, virtually all heads of environmental protection organizations monitoring the ecological situation in Baku were in this position. Judge for yourself. In recent years, in just five instances were criminal proceedings brought against those who are polluting the Caspian Sea, inflicting irreparable damage to this unique reservoir, and not a single case was brought to trial. Seven ordinances of the city's sanitary service on suspending operation of industrial enterprises polluting the atmosphere with sulfur compounds, soot and other pollutants have remained unimplemented. Between 1981 and 1986, there were 17 instances of oil spills into the sea, but no one was given sufficiently serious punishment for this. Even last year, when the Novobakinskiy Oil Refinery imeni Vladimir Ilich [NBNZ] discharged at one time many dozens of tons of petroleum products into Baku Bay, only penalty sanctions followed, and they are being contested to this day.

These facts may suggest that there are forces which directly oppose the requirements of the laws currently in force on protecting the air, land and water.

Alas, no one directly opposes them. I recently had the chance to observe a more than hopeless situation in which the head of one of the environmental protection agencies found himself. An official memorandum he had sent to a higher authority the day before was returned immediately. Pinned to this document was a small sheet of paper containing the following irate instructions: "You have a scope of duties which you are supposed to carry out properly. Instead, you are involved in who knows what and diverting attention to things which do not pertain directly to the matter." The astounded agency head did not dare to give me the instructions for fear of even greater complications; therefore, I quote it as I remember. But here is the text of the memorandum itself, which shows precisely what "things" were categorized as diverting attention. Here it is in abbreviated form:

"Oil refineries, which are large production complexes and situated within city boundaries, are serious sources of pollution of the atmosphere. One of these is the NBNZ, which annually discharges into the atmosphere more than 63,000 tons of hydrocarbons, hydrogen sulfide, sulfur dioxide, carbon monoxide, nitrogen dioxide and other pollutants. These pollutants inflict considerable damage on the national economy and the health of the population. In its official memorandum dated 12 February 1986 addressed to the Nizaminskiy Rayon Committee of the Communist Party of Azerbaijan, the Baku City SES [Sanitary and Epidemiological Station] responded that respiratory ailments prevail in the structure of recorded diseases. There is a clear trend of an increase in the prevalence among children... Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, contained in significant amounts in oil refining and petrochemical waste, cause malignant tumors and are the cause of occupational diseases..."

Why was this essentially frightening official memorandum returned, and with such an irate covering letter? Strange as it may be, it contained nothing new for those it annoyed. Similar documents were received at various levels year after year. They are in the sections of the Baku City Ispolkom, the city procurator's office, the republic Ministry of Health, the city party committee, the former Ministry of the Petroleum Refining and Petrochemical Industry, and many other departments and organizations. In short, everyone knew about the ecological situation in Baku. But there were also more weighty reasons to turn their back on such information, memorandums and reports, or to ignore them altogether. In one way or another, they all pointed out the serious errors in developing the city economy, the dangerous proximity of housing to the petrochemical enterprises, the complete lack or poor operation of purification plants, and the thoughtless commissioning of new capacities which were polluters.

The NBNZ appeared long before the "8-kilometer" housing area emerged. It was only later, when nothing could be done to correct the situation, that they thought about the lack of a protective zone around the refinery, began listening to complaints from the populace and thinking about how to resettle 100,000 people from the polluted zone-- it is not so easy!

The ecological problems accumulated, became more aggravated and more complicated, but no practical solution was found. This is evident from the huge list of unimplemented governmental, departmental and other decrees. Here is just one example. There are 750,000-800,000 cubic meters of polluted sewage being discharged daily by the Baku sewer system into a nearby bay. Each day it inflicts damage on the state amounting to more than 1 million rubles. In 1978, a decree was adopted which provided for measures to protect the Caspian Sea against pollution and to build an external sewer system and purification works. All this was included in a list of priority projects and planned for implementation by 1981.

Following this decree, republic directive bodies developed and adopted several more documents aimed at acceleration of designing, construction and increasing the effectiveness of local purification works for preliminary treatment of sewage before it is discharged into the city sewer system and at further development of the city economy. A little in this plan was done in the past 10 years, but on the whole the problem remained unsolved. Before and now, rivers saturated with petroleum products, acids, alkali, chromium and dyes flow into Baku Bay, and there is chemical smog above the city.

How can it be explained that even governmental measures have not been able to untie the tight knot of ecological problems? First, it has turned out to be too complex and has drawn together the interests of many sectors of the national economy which, simply put, no one has been able through determined efforts to separate. Second, on the outside it was a time of stagnation, when few were concerned about the consequences of the chaotic concentration of ecologically harmful production facilities, and their effect on human health was denied or concealed in collections marked "For Official Use Only," which were inaccessible even to physicians. I have already talked about the alarm signals which were accumulating in the departmental sections. Many of them bear dates already from the years of glasnost. But what did and do we know about the actual situation in the city? Here are short excerpts from certain documents.

From the AzSSR State Committee for the Protection of Nature to the Chairman of the Baku City Ispolkom: "At a meeting of women activists in the Baku Committee of the Communist Party of Azerbaijan, there was criticism about the flagrant violation of statutes on environmental protection by the Baku Tire Plant whose waste is inflicting irreparable harm on the health of women of the

Azerbaijan Scientific Research Institute of Petroleum Machinery... As an investigation showed, the scientific research institute building is covered with a visible layer of soot inside and out. According to analysis of air samples taken on the grounds of the institute, there turned out to be 5.5 more soot than the maximum allowable concentration. Back in 1982, the AzSSR Council of Ministers and the USSR Ministry of the Petroleum Refining and Petrochemical Industry adopted a decision on the complete modernization of the Baku Tire Plant, transferring stock-preparation (the main polluter) to Karadagskiy Rayon. The deadline for commissioning of the new stock-preparation shop was set for 1986, but now is planned for the fourth quarter of 1988. However, the rates of construction are such that this deadline also will be missed..."

From the Baku City SES to the Baku Committee of the Communist Party of Azerbaijan: "The main polluters of the air basin of the city of Baku are enterprises of the Ministry of the Construction Materials Industry (43.2 percent), the Ministry of the Petroleum Refining and Petrochemical Industry (27.6 percent) and the Ministry of the Gas Industry (11 percent). The total amount of pollutants discharged into the atmosphere is 568,000 tons, including 204,000 tons of dust and 25,000 tons of sulfur dioxide. There have been 17,631 sources of harmful pollutants recorded in Baku; only 1,622 of them, or 8.8 percent, have been equipped with gas and dust trapping devices. Oil refineries account for 101,000 tons of the gross discharge of hydrocarbons (177,000 tons per year)."

From the Baku City SES to the Procurator's Office of the City of Baku: "Concerning violation of the Fundamental Public Health Legislation of the USSR and the Union Republics (Section III, Article 18) by the director of the NBNZ. For a long period of time the administration of the refinery has not been fulfilling the requirements of the state sanitary bodies on bringing to proper condition the system for purifying the plant's mixed run-off (Shop No 9). Polluted water continues to be discharged into the Caspian Sea (phenol content is between 3.56 to 700 mg/liter with the acceptable norm of 0.001 mg/liter). We passed resolution No 16 of 22 April 1987 on suspending operation of the shop. However, the director of the refinery has prevented its implementation..."

From Materials Discussed by the Presidium of the AzSSR Council of Ministers Commission on Protecting the Environment and Rational Use of Natural Resources: "Refining of sulfur-bearing oil at refineries located in the development portion of the city has resulted in an increase in pollution of the air basin with sulfur compounds having highly toxic properties. For all this, the Baku City Ispolkom, one of the agencies responsible for protecting the air, continues building residential houses in the sanitary protection zone around the NBNZ..."

From the Baku City SES to the Baku City Committee of the Communist Party of Azerbaijan. "Based on Order No 835/156 of 11 August 1981 of the USSR Ministry of Health and the USSR State Committee for Hydrometeorology and Environmental Control, two zones have been selected in the city of Baku for observing the effect of polluted atmosphere on the health of the population: a relatively polluted zone encompassing Nizaminskiy Rayon and a relatively clean zone encompassing Oktyabrskiy Rayon. Statistical processing of data showed that over the entire period of study of this issue, the overall sickness rate of the populace in Nizaminskiy Rayon was 1.5-2 times higher than the overall rate in Oktyabrskiy Rayon. It should be noted that the proportion of upper respiratory illnesses in both zones was high. However, the quantitative ratio of these illnesses differs greatly. In Nizaminskiy Rayon they comprised 88.5 percent in 1987; in Oktyabrskiy Rayon they comprised 33.3 percent..."

We, the people of Baku, should be grateful that the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Azerbaijan today has given priority to the comprehensive Health Program, which will be discussed at a special Central Committee plenum and in which problems of ecology will occupy a special place. This marks the beginning of a new approach to these problems. As we know, the 5th Session of the Baku Soviet of People's Deputies, 12th Convocation, was recently held. For the first time it examined constructively and in an exacting manner the large spectrum of problems associated with environmental protection measures and the operation of oil refineries. By decision of the session, production activities of Shop No 16 of the NBNZ and mill No 3 of the Baku Flour Mill were suspended as of 1 July. Questions have been raised concerning complete suspension of the refining of sulfur-bearing oil and banning the construction and commissioning of new capacities which pollute the environment. A fundamental goal has even been planned: to relocate refineries beyond Baku's residential zone. It is a good program. But for some reason it occurred to me: If not for the firm stand of the new leadership of the Central Committee on the question of Baku's ecology, what would the decisions of the 5th Session of the Baku Soviet have been then?

For too long city authorities have demonstrated slowness in resolving questions of social importance. And too quickly, almost as an emergency, they have set about realizing them—this also bothers me. The shut-down Shop No 16 of the NBNZ today was, as the session defined it, "not only a major source of pollution of the natural environment, but also a facility creating a serious threat to the residents of Nizaminskiy Rayon." That is all correct, it was a threat. The shop was 9 km from the refinery, but its main pipelines, which pumped aviation kerosene, marine fuel oil and other products under a pressure of 15 atmospheres, ran through the settlements of Arabinok, Serebrovskiy and Razin and stretched along the streets of the "8-kilometer" settlement. In

places economic structures were erected on these pipelines by the residents. But did the Baku City Ispolkom really not know about this situation 5 or 7 years ago?

The problem is elsewhere: The shop was blamed for heating up the Neftchilyar Metro Station with the petroleum products. A governmental commission looked into this matter for a long time. In the spring of last year it came to a final conclusion: The supply lines of Shop No 16 had a leakage. True, they had not been able to identify the location of the breakage, but a special dye put in from the shop leaked out precisely where they expected—in the drainage basin of the Neftchilyar Metro Station. On 1 July, as was decided at the session, the main source gate valve of Shop No 16 was sealed. On 15 July, that is, 2 weeks later, this inviolable seal of state ban was inspected by myself, Z. Guseynov, the head of the section for labor hygiene and environmental protection of the Baku City SES, and N. Aliyev, deputy chief engineer of the NBNZ. But on that same day the three of us went to the Neftchilyar Metro Station, went down to the same drainage basin and saw that the pumps were continuing to pump out petroleum products which were coming in from who knows where.

In my notebook there are entries of the conversations with those who were directly affected by the decision of the Baku City Soviet session to suspend activities of Shop No 16 of the NBNZ.

S. Zalov, former shop mechanic:

"We were refining local, low-sulfur oil and, consequently, were not causing much harm to the health of people. I learned about the leakage of petroleum products from conversations about the work of the commission. But I believe that it was correct to close the shop. Anything could have happened in the areas adjacent to our pipelines. I once caught some kids from one of the yards trying to file through our pipe. As a mechanic, I was responsible for the pipelines day and night. But, the point is, I could not also be an pipeline inspector or guard. I will say honestly that it is like a load was thrown off my shoulders when the shop was sealed up.

"I would like to mention another thing. The shop will be dismantled, this is understandable, and those 68 people who made up the staff are being placed in jobs by the refinery. But directly on the territory of the shop, in the old administrative rooms—the offices and dressing rooms—there remain 19 families who are left, including 45 children. These people are descendants of those who worked here during the war and later. What about them? They are not assigned anywhere, no one takes them into account, and they work in various places. I say this because the plan to remove the shop completely. Someone must think about the people..."

A. Guseynov, director of the NBNZ and deputy of the Baku City Soviet:

"Unfortunately, I did not take part in the work of the 5th Session. I was out of town. But that does not change

things. The questions examined at the sessions were extremely important and urgent, and the criticism directed at the refinery was largely justified. Nevertheless, I would like to note that the economic situation which has taken shape in the city cannot be linked just to the presence of enterprises of the Azneftekhim State Production Association. I would like to know, for example, how much city transportation, personal vehicles and the Azglavenergo Heating Stations pollute the atmosphere. The burn gasoline, solar oil and fuel oil, that is, derivatives of the same raw material which we are using, but in far greater volumes.

"Why not limit by directive fuel consumption for individual types of transport? Really, is it that Baku is flooded with 'Ikaruses' and the sale of gasoline to private individuals is not at all limited? You can buy a ton of it and burn it on the spot, riding around the streets, markets and beaches. Have you ever seen the State Motor Vehicle Inspectorate [GAI] shove a dosimeter hose up an exhaust pipe? The GAI does not have such an instrument. And the sanitary inspectors have no instruments for identifying all the harmful substances hovering over the city. I give you my word that in December, when we fulfill the plan deliveries, I will stop the refinery and invite workers of sanitary control to inspect the background noise index of the refinery! I am confident that it will be no better than it is today.

"The session correctly raised the question about halting the delivery and refining of sulfur-bearing oil—that is where all the harm is. If this is done, the condition of the atmosphere in the city will meet standards. As far as relocating refineries is concerned, I do not think this will be very possible. But refusing sulfur-bearing oil is a present-day reality. This factor alone will make it possible to remove a mass of obsolete equipment. We could have done much with our own forces to protect the environment; net profit for the refinery reaches 36 million rubles per year. But we are allocated only 3 million rubles of this sum, which hardly is enough for labor incentives and cultural and communal facilities..."

There is much in the ecological situation that is contradictory and not fully explained. Above I cited documents to which one cannot help but give credence. From them it follows that a polluted natural environment has an adverse effect on the health of people and contributes to an increase in job-related illnesses. But here is a fact: Not even isolated cases of disease have been recorded at the NBNZ. Perhaps this is being cleverly hidden? I do not know. R. Niyazov, chief physician of the refinery medical unit, said to me quite sincerely: There is not and has not been in the past 10 years anyone who has become sick in connection with the ecological situation or harmful production. Even in the coke shop, where the concentration of dust is very high, there have been no job-related illnesses recorded.

"We just examined 1,300 workers," he explained. "Cardiograms and x-rays were just as they were supposed to be. Alas, there were not even any suspicions. There are

129 people in the medical unit right now. Nothing serious—colds and minor injuries. There are 20 beds empty; I am getting chewed out by the rayon health department for this. But what am I supposed to do? I cannot hospitalize the medical personnel and myself to be sure to meet the plan indicator! Incidentally, I have been working here for 25 years and have no health complaints..."

But what about the situation as a whole for Nizaminskiy Rayon? Since this was a so-called relatively polluted zone, I was primarily interested in the health of the children. L. Gasanova, acting head of the rayon health department, showed me reporting documentation containing quite unfortunate statistics. The number of cases of pneumonia among children were 203 in 1983, 267 in 1984, 307 in 1985, 269 in 1986, and 290 in 1987. By comparison, there were a total of 513 cases recorded in Oktyabrskiy Rayon during these years. The infant mortality rate for children born alive but who died before the age of 1 year is high in the rayon. It is better not to talk about this or compare it with anything. I will just mention that only 26-27 percent of the children are not exposed to any diseases over the course of the year.

By no means do I want to exaggerate, talk only about extremes and disregard the good. But much in the reports and statistics on health differs, is variously interpreted and is involved. But that same data which I just cited for Nizaminskiy Rayon differ greatly from what was reported to me by T. Aliyeva, head of the methods department of the Main Health Administration of the Baku City Ispolkom. How can this be? What should be taken as the basis? Whom is to be believed?

Complaints by the populace relating to air pollution are not subject to systematization and logical comprehension. There where it is crowded and where people live without conveniences you can hear literally curses directed at the NBNZ and other plants. But in the new houses and nice apartments, people take the nearby smoke of the smokestacks, all-possible odors and noises quite calmly. I visited a family dormitory on 19 Botanicheskaya Ulitsa, House 2-A on Ulitsa Neftepererabotchikov, House 23 on Botanicheskaya Ulitsa, and House 17 on Ulitsa Uzbekistana. All these homes are located next to or not far from the refinery. But here is how the people answered when I asked what it was like living in conditions of polluted air.

M. Gadzhiyev, driver:

"In the evenings and at night the refinery gives off some kind of gases. It is impossible to breathe, we are suffocating. How much can we suffer when they will move us out of here..."

M. Bay, pensioner:

"The air is quite normal here. I have lived here next to the refinery for 26 years. I do not sense any of the torments and sufferings, as others say they do."

L. Bukayeva, housewife:

"There are six of us in one room. The refinery is literally right outside the windows. All day long it gives off smoke, and next to us there is a knocking noise, and we cannot sleep. We fret."

R. Muradyan, worker:

"Yes, we sense the odors and still have not gotten used to them. We recently got the apartment in the spring. But I do not complain."

Ya. Novruzova, housewife:

"I have a nice apartment in a new building and live on the ninth floor. I do not sense anything terrible. True, I do have a bad heart, but it has been that way for a long time..."

There are as many opinions as there are people, as the saying goes. But where is the truth? The truth is that the city has neither ecological nor economic order. There also is no shortage of estimates which would make it possible to see the causes of certain phenomena and to prevent the consequences to which they could lead. No one has any doubts that a crisis ecological situation has indeed been created in Baku. Environmental protection agencies are sounding the alarm. But here is a fact: The Baku City SES sends all documentation on pollution of the environment to Moscow—this is the regulation. Why is it sent away? It turns out, it is done for process the data and corresponding conclusions. It turns out that is where the specialists for social hygiene and social ecology are, and we, under conditions of a suffocating city, have none of these specialists. We do not know the real situation in Baku and cannot predict what all this holds for us.

For too long we have not been looking truth in the eye.

12567

Estonian Production Association First To Pay for Natural Resources

18300007b Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
23 Jul 88 p 2

[Article by L. Levitskiy, IZVESTIYA's own correspondent: "Resources at a Suitable Price"]

[Text] For the first time in our country, the Estonslanets Association is willing to pay in full for natural resources. According to standards of natural resource usage, next year it will pay the Committee for the Protection of Nature and Forestry of Estonia 25 million rubles.

The association mines more than 23 million tons of shale annually. This is an enterprise with a rather high organization and standard of production. Its collective does not strive to build the economy to the detriment of ecology. It spends at least 4 million rubles annually on

environmental protection measures. Nevertheless, mining on such a scale is not painless for the land, water and even the atmosphere. Damage to nature is also damage to the population of northeastern Estonia.

How to make up for it? In the future 5-year plan, the country is introducing payment for use of natural resources. It is extremely important to set standards of deductions. It is a complex and not very fruitful pursuit to reexamine and reaffirm calculations. Standards for the time being are just being developed. So as not to waste time, specialists from the Committee for the Protection of Nature and Forestry of Estonia have joined in the research of scientists and based on their methods have prepared interim calculations. With the concurrence of the USSR Ministry of the Coal Industry, the Estonslanets Association has offered to test the idea and mechanism of its implementation already next year. This is not simply a savings of 2 years, but the experience is extremely important both for the republic and for the sector.

"The experiment is sufficiently ensured. Four types of standards have been developed. The compensation is for agricultural and forest lands. Recently the republic's Council of Ministers perfectly justly raised the 'price' of a hectare of land. The value of natural mineral resources has been determined—limestone, gravel, sand, oil shale, peat. Compensation for standard pollution of the environment and compensation for above-standard pollution," says T. Nuudi, chairman of the Committee for Protection of Nature and Forestry of Estonia.

For what and how will Estonslanets pay? It will pay 10 kopecks for each ton of shale mined. But with inefficient use of it, the price of a lost ton will increase to 5.5 rubles. Storing a ton of waste will cost 12 kopecks. A cubic meter of water will cost 2 kopecks. But then, formidable prices have been established for hazardous waste. A ton of phenol in discharges is a loss of almost 19,000 rubles. With such standards, you would not want to do anything but be fond of nature, otherwise you would go broke.

"They are real and fair. Next year we are ready to transfer about 25 million rubles to environmental protection agencies," clarifies V. Seryn, chief engineer of Estonslanets, "but problems arose in the national State Committee on Prices..."

Here is the difficulty. Compensation deductions raise the prime cost and the cost of fuel for the consumers. Expenditures for mining 1 ton of shale increase by 1.1 ruble. The collective, and it is not at fault, also needs some kind of compensation. The State Committee agreed in principle to recover the expenditures with a new price, provided that the deduction standards were

approved by someone. But you see, they had been approved by the Council of Ministers of Estonia as interim standards for use of natural resources for conducting the experiment.

The experiment is extremely interesting and very promising. For the first time, an industrial enterprise will pay in full for natural resources. And for the first time, the money will come into the hands of those who are called upon to protect and restore nature. That is, industry will begin settling accounts with it directly, financing its prosperity...

12567

Reader Complains About Lack of Ukrainian Language Schools in Kharkov

18000026 [Editorial Report] Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian for 17-23 September 1988 carries on page 3 a 50-word letter from G. Shpikatskiy, a resident of Kharkov. Shpikatskiy states that in all of Kharkov there is not a single Ukrainian language school, and most of the signs in stores and workplaces are written in Russian, "when they should be in two languages." He goes on to state that since there are many Poles residing in the Ukraine, there should also be some Polish schools in Lvov, Kharkov, Kiev and Odessa.

Radioactive Accident in Kirovograd Oblast Described

18110003 Kiev RADYANSKA UKRAYINA in Ukrainian 16 Sep 88 p 3

[Article by M. Volok: "Radioactive Ampules"]

[Text] A few days ago in Kirovograd rumors were circulating to the effect that "there had been an accident in the vicinity here at Novonikolayevka; background radioactivity in the city has increased." It would seem that all this is nonsense. Since Kirovograd is located more than 100 kilometers away from the nearest nuclear power station, in the Southern Ukrainian AES, where in the world would this increased radioactivity come from?

However, as I. Melnyk, chief of the oblast's civil defense staff later explained to journalists, this did indeed "occur." And the cause of this accident was exactly the same as that which led to the Chernobyl tragedy two-and-a-half years ago; that is, the gross negligence and carelessness of responsible officials.

Somewhere between 1978 and 1980 the "Kirovogradstroy" Trust acquired some fairly technical instruments containing radioactive materials. An inquest will determine just where these instruments came from and how many were there originally. These instruments were shipped to the production association "Kirovogradzalizobeton," which is an organizational subdivision of the trust. Here these instruments simply lay around never being used for their intended purpose and were eventually thrown away as metal scrap into a water tower. It is

difficult to say how long they remained here. In the autumn of 1985 a neighboring association of Kirovogradstroy Trust and their neighbors, workers from Kirovogradstroy Trust Construction Administration No 2, were mounting a tower crane. The workers needed heavy objects to serve as counterbalance so that the crane would not topple over. Two workers crawled over the enclosure and asked their neighbors for assistance. These neighbors, in turn, "presented" the workers with a few ingots weighing 70 kilograms a piece, which, as it turns out, were the containers of radioactive materials. At this point in time the Chernobyl tragedy was half a year away. Placing three containers on the crane platform, the workers decided to disassemble the remaining two containers out of sheer curiosity. Having gotten through several protective layers of steel and lead to a small ampule containing powder, they broke open this ampule. They stirred the powder around with their hands, smelled it and then poured it out onto the ground. One of the workers put the ampule from the other container into his pocket and when it accidentally broke, he threw it out also.

Shortly thereafter the hands of both these "investigators" began to burn and the fabric on their pantlegs started to fall off. However, while in the hospital, the workers did not say anything about their previous adventure. And it was not until a few days later that they let it slip to doctors. An examination of the area in the vicinity of the construction administration confirmed that there were sources of radioactive contamination there. A special commission under the auspices of the oblast executive committee was immediately convened. It took exigent measures to decontaminate the area and gave workers preventative examinations. The construction administration's project has been temporarily halted. The trust has been fenced in and is being guarded. The contaminated refuse and earth will be taken away in special containers to a specifically designated place. In a month's time all the employees of Kirovogradzalizobeton Association Construction Administration No 2 and residents of nearby buildings will undergo medical examinations.

The radius of the contaminated area is not very large; thus, it has not affected the background radioactivity of the city. But it must have frightened many people. Criminal charges have been lodged against the responsible officials for violation of the regulations overseeing the storage, registration and utilization of radioactive materials.

Yerevan University Official Advocates New Union, Autonomous Republics

18300340 Yerevan KOMMUNIST in Russian 25 Jun 88 p 3

[Interview with Professor L. Karapetyan, doctor of philosophical sciences and prorector of Yerevan State University, by Armpress correspondent; date and place not given]

[Text] As we know, the 19th All-Union Party Conference will give much attention to questions of international

relations and the development of each nation and nationality. An Armpress correspondent talked with Professor L. Karapetyan, doctor of philosophical sciences and prorector of Yerevan State University, in this regard.

[Question] On the eve of the summit between the leaders of the Soviet Union and the United States, an American correspondent asked CPSU Central Committee General Secretary M.S. Gorbachev: "Is your policy of perestroika necessitating fundamental changes in the current relations between the nationalities which populate the USSR?" M.S. Gorbachev gave an extremely clear and objective answer: "With us it is not a question of changing the socialist principles of relations between the nations and nationalities of our country. But we will correct violations of these principles. The events taking place recently in some of our republics were caused precisely by this." How would you comment on this statement?

[Answer] If it is a question of violations of socialist principles of inter-nationality relations, it must be understood that these principles were approved and were functioning at some stage of our country's development.

We know that the basic principles of national policy and development of inter-nationality relations in a multinational socialist society were developed by the founders of scientific socialism. They were creatively developed in the works of V.I. Lenin and in program documents of the Leninist party of bolsheviks.

Tenets, such as equality of all nations and nationalities, abolition of all national oppression, ensuring the right of nations to self-determination and creating conditions for their unification on a truly democratic basis, achieving actual equality of all nations and nationalities, and ensuring their comprehensive growth and rapprochement, occupy a central place in Marxist-Leninist theory and the program on the nationality issue. In their sum total, they express the requirement of the universal principle of harmonious combination international and national interests. Practical implementation of these principles became possible after the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution. From its very first days of its activities in this area, the party of bolsheviks proceeded from the fact that there could not be internationalism without taking national interests into account or without combining them with the interests of the whole state.

In the process of establishing Soviet power in our multinational country, first of all the question arose of creating a national state system of liberated peoples. This is explained by the fact that "foreigners" of tsarist Russia did not have their own state system. V.I. Lenin brilliantly foresaw that only with a consistently democratic resolution of this problem, as well as other problems of national relations, would the working masses of the various nations and nationalities be able to obtain the opportunity of independent government and themselves

unified into a single multinational socialist state. "...If only the oppressors of yesterday," he pointed out, "did not insult the highly developed democratic feeling of self-respect of a long-oppressed nation; if only they had offered it equality in everything, including in construction, in the experiment to build 'their' state..."

The party of bolsheviks not only proclaimed but also ensured for all nations the actual opportunity to create a national state and implement the right to self-determination. Many nations and nationalities acquired statehood and were involved in active political thought. Simultaneously, they established a close alliance with Soviet Russia and soon expressed a voluntary desire to unite with it into a single multinational federative state.

It is also known that a different approach was discovered in the process of practical resolution of this important but difficult problem. Some proposed creating a "confederation of republics;" others proposed so-called "autonomization." In his works and speeches, V.I. Lenin showed the fallacy of these plans and explained that a "confederation" would not ensure achievement of the set goal of creating a monolithic state, and "autonomization" could result in violation of the principle of equality of the republics being united and to the manifestation of great-power chauvinistic tendencies. Actually, the enormous work of the party and the successes achieved in establishing new, truly democratic relations between nations could be negated.

In summarizing the positive results of the initial period of development of the federative ties of independent Soviet republics, V.I. Lenin gave paramount attention to the need for absolute observance of such principles of the Soviet Socialist Federation as voluntary participation in the unification, equality of the republics, and the right to self-determination. Lenin considered consistent implementation of these principles to be a most important guarantee of combining national and international interests and ensuring scientific management of the multinational Soviet state.

[Question] As noted in the Theses for the 19th Party Conference, in this lie our strength and guarantee of prosperity of our country as a whole, as well as of each nation and nationality separately. The remarkable results of implementing the Leninist national policy during the 70 years since the October Revolution are known to all.

[Answer] Yes, life has completely confirmed the great leader's foresight. Having united on a federative basis into a unified socialist state, with the fraternal assistance of the great Russian people, previously oppressed peoples were able to consolidate the revolutionary gains and ensure their national and social regeneration. It is known that before the establishment of Soviet power, there was virtually no industry in Siberia, Central Asia, the Caucasus and other outlying districts of the country, although these areas occupied about 80 percent of its

territory. The picture has changed radically during the years of Soviet power. Unification of the republics has made it possible to concentrate all forces and resources and direct them at restoring and further developing the wrecked national economy. The main thing is that the economic and socio-cultural inequality of peoples, inherited from the old system, was basically eliminated in the process of building socialism.

The harmonious combination of national and international interests in the area of management of the economy—a decisive sphere of social life—caused a corresponding development in the spiritual life of all peoples of the multinational Soviet society. It is hard for the current generation of people to imagine that 60 years ago total illiteracy reigned in their country, and more than 40 nationalities did not even have a written language. But now, in addition to the broad network of general education schools implementing a program of universal secondary education, the country has about 1,000 VUZes and 4,200 technical schools. All union republics have their own academy of sciences with dozens of scientific research institutions, in which thousands of highly qualified scientists representing the native nationalities work.

The literature and art of all peoples of the Soviet Union have achieved unprecedented growth. Tens of thousands of theaters, clubs, palaces, libraries and other centers of culture serve the multinational people.

[Question] Today, during the period of restructuring and democratization of our society, flagrant mistakes and "irregularities" committed in relations between nations have been identified, and in a number of cases a departure from the Leninist principles of national policy.

[Answer] The objective analysis of the real achievements and the current state of relations between nations, given at the 27th CPSU Congress in M.S. Gorbachev's report on the 70th anniversary of the Great October Revolution and in the decisions of recent CPSU Central Committee plenums, has shown that serious violations were committed in implementing national policy during the period of the cult of personality, stagnation and conservatism. Specifically, they were reflected in the fact that the Marxist-Leninist doctrine on the need for thorough consideration of the historical, political, legal, cultural, ethnic, socio-psychological and other factors in organizing the management of relations between nations in a multinational state was buried in oblivion. What is more, administrative and territorial boundaries between certain republics were voluntaristically changed; union republics and autonomous oblasts were created separately, although representatives of the same nationality lived in them and their territories were contiguous. The reactionist principle of "divide and conquer," well-known to history, again revealed itself in the Stalinist practice. The Stalinist repressions embraced not only millions of innocent people and their families, but also

entire peoples. Meanwhile, the complete resolution of the nationalities question and all problems of relations between nations was proclaimed as the indisputable truth.

Let us take, for example, the question of Nagorny Karabakh and the events surrounding it, on which the attention of the Soviet people is riveted with a feeling of deep alarm and optimistic expectations. Reliable historical documents indicate that after the establishment of Soviet power in Azerbaijan (April 1920) and Armenia (November 1920), the Revolutionary Committee of Azerbaijan passed a declaration which proclaimed: "Nagorny Karabakh, Zangezur and Nakhichevan are recognized as a constituent part of the Armenian Socialist Republic." V.I. Lenin welcomed this most important act of internationalism. Both local newspapers and PRAVDA (4 December 1988) wrote about this during those days. However, as a result of Stalin's voluntaristic interference later, resolution of this issue was reconsidered and frozen for years.

Beginning in the 1920's, the Armenian population of Nagorny Karabakh repeatedly turned to the union authorities with a request for unification with Soviet Armenia. But only under conditions of the revolutionary perestroika has a real formulation of this question become possible. The lesson of PRAVDA, given by the 27th CPSU Congress and developed in decisions of subsequent CPSU Central Committee plenums, has led the party to conclude that there are a multitude of problems unresolved or resolved not in accord with the ideals of socialism. "We are rehabilitating PRAVDA," the editorial 'Principles of Perestroika: Revolutionary Nature of Thought and Action' states, "purging it of counterfeit and cunning truths which led to the dead-end street of social apathy..." The development of democracy and glasnost, as the chief requirement of perestroika, has given the peoples and nations of our multinational country an opportunity to get out of the dead-end street of social apathy and think through their unresolved problems from a position of social activity. In Nagorny Karabakh, the people spoke of this in complete accord with the requirements of perestroika, socialist democracy and glasnost. As was already noted in the resolution of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers on Nagorny Karabakh, for years the socio-economic and spiritual interests of the people here have been infringed upon, their sense of national dignity has been humiliated, and steps have not been taken to prevent outrages and violence. It is clear that under such conditions the people cannot help but hope for a just resolution of the question of their fate.

[Question] In your view, what are the ways of developing and strengthening relations between nations and improving the union of Soviet peoples?

The CPSU Central Committee Theses for the 19th All-Union Conference note the need for a democratic resolution of questions of national policy in accordance

with the Leninist principle of combining international and national interests. "Within the framework of perestroika," it is stated, "urgent steps should be considered and taken for further development of the Soviet federation." Every literate person should know that an inalienable problem of developing the Soviet federation is the further improvement of state system and the status of union and autonomous republics, autonomous oblasts and other forms of national statehood.

Obviously, these questions will be the subject of comprehensive discussion at the upcoming party conference and at the CPSU Central Committee Special Plenum on questions of national policy.

In the area of further improving the Soviet federation, more concrete definition of the constitutional status of union and autonomous republics, krays, oblasts and okrugs, their rights and the principles of mutual relations between them are of paramount importance. It is advisable to grant all autonomous republics the status of an independent subject of the Soviet Socialist Federation. Apparently, there is an imminent need to change a number of autonomous republics into union republics, and autonomous oblasts into autonomous republics.

More than 100 nations and nationalities live in the Soviet Union, but there are only 53 various forms of national statehood. It seems that based on consideration of the principle of right to self-determination, they should be granted a specific form of autonomy up to and including a national rayon, village and rural soviet. As V.I. Lenin noted, conditions must be created in the Soviet federation which assume the "most complete freedom of various localities and even various communities in developing diverse forms of state, social, as well as economic life."

In the process of comprehensive development of democracy, as the chief condition of successful accomplishment of the multipronged tasks of the perestroika strategy, there is an imminent need to expand the rights of union and autonomous republics, krays, oblasts and okrugs so they are given the actual possibility of sovereign resolution of the question of their own vital activities.

National and territorial problems should be resolved immediately and radically on a consistently democratic basis, taking into account the will of the national minority located in a given republic. In fact, the founders of Marxism-Leninism noted that each nation must be its own master, and the right to self-determination means that this question should be resolved not by a central parliament but by the parliament, by the Sejm, and by referendum of the national minority which is separated.

Based on this, we should reexamine the provision of the USSR Constitution according to which an autonomous oblast cannot leave a union republic without the consent of its Supreme Soviet. It is necessary to make changes to the boundaries between certain union republics so as to reunite the population of the same nationality living side by side.

Of great importance in the matter of further democratic development of the Soviet multinational state is the provision of the CPSU Central Committee Theses which notes "the need to activate the institutions by means of which national interests must be identified and reconciled."

In this regard, we share the opinion on fundamentally reexamining and expanding the function of the Council of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet, which today actually duplicates the activities of the Council of the Union. The direct purpose of the Council of Nationalities is to resolve fundamental problems of relations between nations occurring between union and autonomous republics, krays, oblasts and other nation-state formations.

In a multinational socialist country, it is advisable to create a supreme constitutional arbitration body which must develop proposals for all international disputes which arise and submit them to the Council of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet or to the union government.

All nations and nationalities should be proportionally represented in all all-union leadership and management bodies, as required by V.I. Lenin.

Of course, it is also necessary to consolidate constitutionally legal and political guarantees ensuring absolute observance of all democratic principles of the Soviet federation, which are the basis of harmonious combination of international and internal interests.

I do not think there is a need to prove that during the period of perestroika a chief condition and basic guarantee of implementing a socially just policy in international relations is the complete restoration and strict observance of the Leninist program on the question of nationalities. To this end, it is necessary, first of all, to correct the significant violations of its requirements committed as a result of Stalinist voluntarism and usurpation, which led to a certain deformation of international relations. It is clear that the strategic course being pursued by the part of fundamental restructuring of all spheres of life of the Soviet society and overcoming the deformations of socialism also encompasses the sphere of national policy and complete restoration of the Leninist principles of harmonious combination of international and national interests.

END OF

FICHE

DATE FILMED

9 November 88